

DATE ISSUED: July 27, 2000

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL: R-OPC-21663

Closing Date: August 28, 2000

Closing Time: 2:00 p.m. EST

THIS PROCUREMENT IS NON-RESTRICTIVE  
OPEN TO BOTH SMALL AND LARGE BUSINESSES

Dear Prospective Offeror:

Attached is Request for Proposal (RFP) R-OPC-21663 for "IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WELFARE TO WORK VOUCHER EVALUATION PROGRAM" under the Office of Policy Development and Research.

The Standard Industrial Code (SIC) for this solicitation is 8742 and the size standard is \$5 million. It is the Department's intent to award a Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee type contract with a base period of sixty (60) months. However, the Government reserves the right to award the type of contract determined most appropriate following negotiations. The incumbent contractor is Abt Associates, Incorporated.

For the hearing impaired community, the Telecommunications for the Deaf (TDD) number is (202) 708-4079.

Offerors may access the following web sites to receive additional information regarding the Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) programs:

<http://www.hudweb.hud.gov> & <http://www.hudweb.hud.gov/po/e/>

If there are any questions concerning this RFP, it is requested that they be submitted in writing to the Contracting Officer at the location noted in Block 7 of the Standard Form 33 or FAX to (202) 401-2032, no later than 15 calendar days prior to the RFP closing date.

The RFP is structured in accordance with the Uniform Contract Format required by the Federal Acquisition Regulation. Identified below are certain important items and their location in the RFP:

1. The Statement of Work (SOW) is in Part I, Section C.
2. Factors for Award are in Part IV, Section M. The Government anticipates awarding one contract for this requirement.
3. Time and due date of offers are in Block 9 of SF 33. Late proposal rules (FAR 52.215-1) are incorporated by Reference in Part IV, Section L, and will be strictly applied. Address for receipt of proposals is in Block 7 of the SF 33.
4. Contact person for additional information is in Block 10 of the SF 33.

5. Instructions and Conditions concerning proposed preparation and submission are in Part IV, Section L. Refer to FAR Clause 52.219-9 which is incorporated by reference in Section I of this solicitation.
6. Technical and Cost Proposals: All offerors shall submit as part of their offer a technical proposal for the basic effort. Also, all offerors are to submit a cost proposal for the base period under separate cover. Technical and cost proposals are to be submitted under separate cover in respective volumes (Parts I and II) as described in Part IV, in Section L.
7. Many clauses of this RFP are incorporated by reference using FAR citations. Offerors are responsible for familiarizing themselves with all contract requirements, including those merely cited.
8. Prospective offerors should be aware that the HUD building is a secure building. Visitors must enter at either the Northeast entrance or the Southeast main entrance. Visitors will be required to walk through a metal detector, have all belongings screened by an x-ray system, show valid picture identification, and sign the visitor's log. Guards will telephone the visitor's HUD contact to announce their arrival and confirm their appointment prior to allowing entry. This will require extra time. Offerors must therefore ensure that any commercial delivery service or company employee has appropriate identification, and allow extra time for any hand-carried deliveries. Delays experienced at the guard desk or refusal of admission **DO NOT** constitute excusable delays. **PROPOSALS MUST BE IN THE DESIGNATED PLACE, ROOM 5256, NO LATER THAN THE EXACT TIME SPECIFIED TO BE CONSIDERED FOR AWARD.**

**OFFEROR ALERT!** IF YOU OBTAIN THIS SOLICITATION FROM A SOURCE OTHER THAN HUD, OR IF YOU DOWNLOADED IT FROM HUD'S HOME PAGE, YOU WILL NOT RECEIVE ANY AMENDMENTS TO IT. All amendments will be posted on HUD's Home Page at: <http://www.hud.gov/cts/ctsoprtty.html>

You are advised to check HUD's Home Page periodically for any amendments to this solicitation. Amendments may also be requested from the office issuing this solicitation. If you received this solicitation as a result of a written request to the issuing office, you WILL receive all amendments.

Sincerely,

Neil Gross  
Contracting Officer  
Research Systems Branch  
Office of Procurements & Contracts

Enclosure

<b>SOLICITATION, OFFER AND AWARD</b>		1. THIS CONTRACT IS A RATED) ORDER UNDER DPAS (15 CFR 700)		RATING		PAGE 1 OF 1 PAGES			
2. CONTRACT NO.		3. SOLICITATION NO. R-OPC-21663		4. TYPE OF SOLICITATION <input type="checkbox"/> SEALED BID (IFB) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEGOTIATED (RFP)		5. DATE ISSUED		6. REQUISITION/PURCHASE NO R-2000-R-00049	
7. ISSUED BY: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Office of Procurement and Contracts 451 Seventh Street, SW, Room 5256 Washington, DC 20410-3000				8. ADDRESS OFFER TO (If other than Item 7) Neil Gross Contracting Officer					

NOTE: In sealed bid solicitations, "offer" and "Offeror" mean "bid" and "bidder".

### SOLICITATION

9. Sealed offers in <b>original</b> and 5 copies for furnishing the supplies or services in the schedule will be received at the place specified in Item 8, or if handcarried, in the depository located in Item 7 until 2:00PM local time (Date)	
---	--

CAUTION - LATE Submissions, Modifications, and Withdrawals: Section L, Provision No. 52.214-7 or 52.215-1.  
All offers are subject to all terms and conditions contained in this solicitation.

10. FOR INFORMATION CALL:		A. NAME Neil O. Gross		B. TELEPHONE NO. (Include area code) (NO COLLECT CALLS) (202) 708-0614, ext. 2724			
11. TABLE OF CONTENTS							
(X)	SEC.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE(S)	(X)	SEC.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE(S)
PART I - THE SCHEDULE				PART II - CONTRACT CLAUSES			
X	A	SOLICITATION/CONTRACT FORM		X	I	CONTRACT CLAUSES	
X	B	SUPPLIES OR SERVICES AND PRICES/COST		PART III - LIST OF DOCUMENTS, EXHIBITS AND OTHER ATTACH			
X	C	DESCRIPTION/SPECS/WORK STATEMENT		X	J	LIST OF ATTACHMENTS	
X	D	PACKAGING AND MARKING		PART IV - REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS			
X	E	INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE		X	K	REPRESENTATIONS, CERTIFICATIONS AND OTHER STATEMENTS OF OFFERORS	
X	F	DELIVERIES OR PERFORMANCE		X	L	INSTRS., CONDS., AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS	
X	G	CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION DATA		X	M	EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD	
X	H	SPECIAL CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS					

### OFFER (Must be fully completed by offeror)

NOTE: Item 12 does not apply if the solicitation includes the provision at 52.214-16, Minimum Bid Acceptance Period												
12. In compliance with the above, the undersigned agrees, if this offer is accepted within _____ calendar days (60 calendar days unless a different period is inserted by the offeror) from the date for receipt of offers specified above, to furnish any or all items upon which prices are offered at the price set opposite each item, delivered at the designated point(s), within the time specified in the schedule.												
13. DISCOUNT FOR PROMPT PAYMENT (See Section I, Clause No. 52.232-8)		10	CALENDAR DAYS	%	20	CALENDAR DAYS	%	30	CALENDAR DAYS	%	CALENDAR DAYS	%
14. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF AMENDMENTS (The offeror acknowledges receipt of the amendments to the SOLICITATION for offerors and related documents numbered and dated:		AMENDMENT NO.		DATE		AMENDMENT NO.		DATE				
15A. NAME CODE FACILITY						16. NAME AND TITLE OF PERSON AUTHORIZED TO SIGN OFFER (Type or print)						
15B. TELEPHONE NO. (Include area code)		15C. CHECK IF REMITTANCE ADDRESS IS DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE - ENTER SUCH ADDRESS IN SCHEDULE				17. SIGNATURE		18. OFFER DATE				

### AWARD (To be completed by Government)

19. ACCEPTED AS TO ITEMS NUMBERED		20. AMOUNT		21. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION	
22. AUTHORITY FOR USING OTHER THAN FULL AND OPEN COMPETITION 10 U.S.C.2304 (c) ( ) 41 U.S.C. 253(c) ( )		23. SUBMIT INVOICES TO ADDRESS SHOWN IN (4 copies unless otherwise specified)		ITEM	
24. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 7) CODE		25. PAYMENT WILL BE MADE BY CODE			
26. NAME OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)		27 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (Signature of Contracting Officer)		28 AWARD DATE	

IMPORTANT - Award will be made on this Form, or on Standard Form 26, or by other authorized official notice.

## PART I - THE SCHEDULE

## SECTION B - SUPPLIES OR SERVICES AND PRICE/COSTS

## B.1 AS 104 CONTRACT DEFINITIZATION-INDEFINITE QUANTITY

This is an Indefinite Quantity contract as defined at Subpart 16.504 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and in Section I, clause FAR 52.216-22, Indefinite Quantity. Services or supplies provided by the contractor under this contract shall be secured by the issuance of task orders placed in accordance with the following clauses: FAR 52.216-18, Ordering; FAR 52.216-19, Order Limitations; and, or Task Ordering Procedures (for completion type task orders).

## B.2 DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES

The contractor shall conceptualize, organize and conduct high quality research and evaluations within stringent time constraints related to the systematic evaluation of the Welfare to Work Voucher Program.

B.3 AS 108 MINIMUM/MAXIMUM QUANTITIES FOR ORDER  
(SERVICES OR SUPPLIES) (NOV 1997)

(a) The Government shall place orders under this contract which shall cumulatively total at least \$500,000.

(b) The maximum cumulative dollar value of orders placed under this contract shall not exceed \$5,000,000.

(See also Section I, clause FAR 52.216-22, Indefinite Quantity)

## B.4 AS 114 NOT-TO-EXCEED LIMITATION (NOV 1997)

(a) The total estimated funds needed for the performance of this contract are not yet obligated. The total obligation of funds available at this time for performance of work or deliveries is TO BE DETERMINED. The Government shall not order, nor shall the contractor be required to accept orders for, work and/or deliveries which cause the Government's obligation under this contract to exceed the stated funding limit.

(b) The Government may unilaterally increase the amount obligated through contract modification(s) until the full contract value has been obligated.

## B.5 AS 116 ESTIMATED COST AND FIXED FEE (NOV 1997)

(a) It is estimated that the total cost to the Government for full performance of this contract will be TO BE DETERMINED AT AWARD, of which TO BE DETERMINED UPON AWARD represents the estimated reimbursable costs, and TO BE DETERMINED UPON AWARD represents the fixed fee (if any).

(b) If this contract is incrementally funded, the following shall apply:

(1) Total funds currently available for payment and allotted to this contract are TO BE DETERMINED UPON AWARD, of which TO BE DETERMINED UPON AWARD represents the limitation for reimbursable costs and TO BE DETERMINED UPON AWARD represents the proration of fixed fee (if any). For further provisions on funding, see clause FAR 52.232-22, Limitation of Funds, herein.

(2) If and when the contract is fully funded, as specified in paragraph (a) of this clause, the clause at FAR 52.232-20, Limitation of Cost, herein, shall become applicable.

(3) The Contracting Officer may allot additional funds to the contract up to the total specified in paragraph (a) of this clause without the concurrence of the contractor.

## SECTION C - DESCRIPTION/SPECIFICATIONS/STATEMENT OF WORK

## I. BACKGROUND STATEMENT AND NEED FOR SERVICES

This Work Statement presents the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) objectives and requirements for acquiring Indefinite Quantity Contract (IQC) support for implementation of a Congressionally-mandated evaluation of the Welfare to Work Voucher Program over the next five years. This IQC is wholly committed to the implementation and assessment of the Welfare to Work Voucher Program. HUD has already funded a contract (which will be described below) to set up a controlled experiment to evaluate that program. This IQC will support a series of task orders to implement and assess that controlled experiment in nine sites [Atlanta and Augusta, GA; Fresno City and County, CA; Houston, TX; Los Angeles City and County, CA; Springfield and Boston under the Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development; and Spokane, WA], and to support other research efforts relating to Welfare to Work Vouchers in these or other sites over a period of five years.

The FY 1999 Appropriations Act for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development (P.L. 105-276) set aside \$283,000,000 of tenant-based assistance to help eligible families make the transition from welfare to work. The program provides for a competition among public housing agencies (PHA). 113 PHAs have been selected competitively for funding based "on the need for and quality of the proposed program (including innovative approaches), the extent to which the assistance will be coordinated with welfare reform and welfare to work initiatives, and the extent to which the application demonstrates that tenant-based assistance is critical to the success of assisting eligible families to obtain or retain employment". An additional eight applicants received set-aside assistance for the same purpose. The Act also provides for a detailed evaluation of the effect of providing assistance under the program. The Department will use this IQC to meet that mandate.

There are three Statements of Work (SOW) in this package. Two are bound to the award of this particular contract, and one is provided for the information of potential offerors. The one provided for information is Attachment \_1\_, hereafter referred to as the "Evaluation Set-Up SOW". It is the SOW for a contract awarded to Abt Associates, Inc. in August 1999 and scheduled to terminate in December 2000, to perform the Set-up functions for the Congressionally-mandated evaluation of the Welfare to Work Voucher Program. Those functions were to include selection of the evaluation sites,, negotiation with each of those sites concerning how the requirements of the evaluation could be accommodated to local implementation of the Voucher Program, design of random assignment procedures, designing of data collection and tracking procedures, comment on the baseline survey instrument. It also contained provisions in the SOW that would accommodate the possibility that one or two of the sites might begin assignment of

the vouchers before the contract was over.

The second SOW is the overall SOW for the Welfare to Work Vouchers Evaluation IQC and hereafter referred to as the "Evaluation IQC SOW". This is the SOW that is hereby being competed. It is intended solely to support the ongoing evaluation of the Welfare to Work Voucher Program initiated from the Evaluation Set-Up SOW. The Evaluation IQC SOW provides for various task orders the total of which would last up to five years. The Department expects that one offeror will be awarded the IQC contract and will be assigned tasks as they are identified.

The third SOW, Attachment \_2\_, is for the first task order under the Evaluation IQC SOW. It will hereafter be referred to as the "Evaluation Follow-On SOW". This SOW supports all those activities involving initial evaluation implementation that were not accomplished through the Evaluation Set-Up SOW contract. It would include any random assignment and administration of the baseline instrument not completed during the term of the Evaluation Set-Up SOW, development of tracking instruments, tracking of treatment and control group members and design and implementation of an Interim Report. The term of this task order is 14 months. Review of Offeror's proposals in response to the Evaluation Follow-On SOW will constitute part of the overall assessment of their proposals for the Evaluation IQC SOW.

## II. BASIC DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

The provision of housing assistance to low-income families helps them to meet an immediate human need. Little is known, though, about the long-term effects, positive or negative, of such assistance on the economic self-sufficiency of families. It could be argued that all forms of assistance will tend to perpetuate low incomes for recipients; for example, the only possible conclusion from the static version of labor economics is that housing assistance will lower work effort (Khadduri, Shroder, and Steffen, 1998).

In the case of housing, however, it could also be argued that, without some assurance that shelter will be available, recipients will find it hard to maintain long-term commitment to education and training; an additional increment of human capital is generally associated with higher work effort. In addition to human capital effects, it could be argued that portable tenant-based assistance should make it easier for families to move where the jobs are, which often means where rents are higher, and, therefore, that tenant-based housing assistance should raise effective work effort. Congress and the Administration adopted this presumption when they authorized the Welfare to Work Voucher program.

The issue of the impact of assisted housing on employment and income is fundamental to housing policy, but there is little research on the subject. PD&R is aware of three relevant publications. Murray (1980) took findings from several sources, imposed a strong functional form assumption on preferences, and

calculated small negative effects of public housing on short-term labor supply. Reingold (1997) used data from the Urban Poverty Family Life Survey and found that inner-city public housing residents were no less likely to be employed than similar inner-city tenants living in privately-owned units. Ong (1998), on the basis of a special survey in California, reported that paid hours of work among welfare recipients who have certificates or vouchers are significantly higher than among the unassisted, while the work hours of welfare recipients in public housing are not significantly different from the unassisted.

Non-experimental evidence on these points seldom speaks with the same authority as data from a major experiment like the one that HUD intends to implement under this procurement. Murray uses experimental data, but at several steps removed from the demonstrations generating the data. Reingold and Ong use surveys, which inherently cannot control for all the factors affecting selection into housing assistance programs. The assisted differ from the unassisted in ways that are both observed and unobserved by researchers, and differences in behavior that remain after all observable variables are controlled might still be caused by differences in the people using or not using the assistance program, rather than by the program itself. Although Ong tests his conclusions using standard statistical corrections for self-selection, the untestable assumptions required for those corrections may be more stringent than the data can support.

In addition to the studies cited above, various experimental evaluations of training programs or welfare reform programs have revealed that the welfare receipt and/or earnings of sub-groups of persons with Section 8 tenant-based or public housing assistance often respond differently than do those of the unassisted. However, housing assistance has not been randomly assigned in those experiments; those findings, therefore, do not clarify the relationship between housing assistance and economic self-sufficiency. The intention of this study will be to implement an experimental evaluation so that the impact of tenant-based rental assistance on families' employment, earnings and mobility can be tested. HUD is making use of an experimental, panel design evaluation platform for one other recent demonstration, the Moving to Opportunity Demonstration, information about which can be obtained from HUD USER.

The core of the evaluation the Department has chosen to perform is a controlled experiment. Like a lottery, a controlled experiment involves random assignment of program participants at selected sites either to an experimental (or treatment) group, who are given the treatment (e.g., the vaccine, diet, educational opportunity, or, in this case, the housing voucher) or to a control group, the members of which do not receive the treatment. The control group offers valuable information about what would have happened to the program group if the program had never been implemented and, thus, offers the most reliable footing for assessing the difference a new program makes. By its very structure, then, a controlled experiment permits identification of the independent impact of the treatment variable. By its nature, too, it lends itself to quantitative analysis.



Of course, detection of the permanent impact of a treatment, such as the impact of housing assistance on employment, income and mobility, takes time, at least five to ten years. That is why this IQC proposes implementation of a controlled experiment over an extended period, so that reliable estimates of program impact can be obtained.

The Welfare to Work Voucher demonstration is intended to provide clear experimental evidence on the fundamental issue whether housing assistance increases the likelihood that recipients will obtain or retain employment. The eligible target population for the demonstration consists of families who are currently receiving aid under Transitional Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), the federal block grant program established in 1996 to replace the long-standing Aid to Families with Dependent Children program, or who are currently eligible for TANF, or who have received TANF in the previous two years. The program will be evaluated in nine sites with PHAs who have been awarded at least 450 Section 8 vouchers. Families selected to participate will be randomly assigned to either an experimental (i.e., assigned a Welfare to Work voucher) or control group (i.e., not assigned such a voucher) after the State or local housing authority (HA) determines that tenant-based housing assistance would be critical to these families in successfully obtaining or retaining employment. The experimental group will receive both a housing voucher and supportive services arranged with other agencies. The control group will not receive housing assistance through this demonstration; they may, however, receive housing assistance, possibly in the form of a subsequent voucher from non- demonstration sources. Moreover, whether they receive the supportive services or not will depend on the depth of resources available in the locality. In other words, there is the distinct possibility that members of the control group as well as the experimental group will receive rental assistance and/or services. We understand that this is difficult from an experimental viewpoint, but at least the level of supportive services a family receives will not be a principal focus in the evaluation. Offerors should incorporate research methods that address these realities.

The contractor's primary role in this procurement is to implement the experiment outlined above and set in place through the task order awarded in response to the Evaluation Set-Up SOW. In this regard, this Evaluation IQC Statement of Work will specify clearly what tasks belong to the set-up contract currently being implemented and what tasks belong to this larger follow-on contract for which this is the Statement of Work.

The principal questions of the demonstration are:

Are adults and children of working age in eligible families who receive Welfare to Work vouchers more likely to obtain or retain employment than those in eligible families who do not receive such vouchers? Is the average income of those families who receive vouchers greater than those who do not? Is the quality of the jobs obtained or retained by those who receive vouchers higher than those who do not receive vouchers?

Are eligible families who receive vouchers more likely to move to neighborhoods closer to existing or prospective employment, employment training, services or public transportation than eligible families who do not receive vouchers?

It would not be unprecedented for the final evaluation to determine that outcomes for the treatment group differed from those for controls in some sites and not others. Such cross-site variation might be caused by:

differences in the effectiveness of targeting assistance by HAs;

differences in State welfare reform plans;

differences in participant eligibility;

differences in the nature and strength of local partnerships among agencies responsible for other welfare reform and welfare-to-work initiatives;

differences in the character and effectiveness of supportive services;

differences in the local housing and labor markets;

differences in the employment potential of the local population.

Clearly, implementation of this evaluation involves activities at the local level that are the traditional responsibility of HAs, e.g., maintenance of the waiting list and eligibility determinations, and other activities that are unique to the evaluation, e.g., random assignment into the experimental and control groups or tracking of both voucher recipients and non-recipients. The Contractor will be required to devise work plans that divide the labor and other costs associated with the evaluation between the contractor and the HAs in a manner that will ensure cost-effective, timely, and reliable implementation. The division of labor may vary from one site to another. However, during the Evaluation Set-Up Contract, Abt Associates did hire Site Assistants at each site to assume most of the HA's duties related to the evaluation. All participating sites at this time have agreed in principle to the use of Site Assistants paid from the relevant Evaluation Contract (either the existing Evaluation Set-Up or the future Evaluation Follow-On Contract) to perform the major evaluation functions.

Abt Associates will have already reached agreement with each site about how the evaluation can be accommodated to the local program design and procedures. The Contractor for this IQC will be expected to continue that effort to balance the necessity of customizing the administration of the evaluation at each site in response to the needs and capacity of the individual HAs with the importance of assuring reliable cross-site comparison.

[The Appropriations Act that created the Welfare to Work Voucher

Program set aside one percent , or \$2.83 million, of the program appropriation for evaluation. The Notice of Funds Availability for the program competition indicated that part of that sum would be used to meet the administrative costs incurred by HAs in implementing the program evaluation. For purposes of program administration, costs must, in addition to being real costs, i.e., they must be costs that are actually incurred by the HA (or equivalent), meet one of the following standards to be considered eligible:

1. Eligible administrative costs must be directly related to the implementation of the evaluation itself; or
2. the costs required to accommodate the processing, surveying and tracking of evaluation participants beyond those that would have been necessary to implement successfully the HA's Welfare to Work voucher Program (i.e., beyond the number who would have been members of the treatment group plus those necessary to ensure full lease-up); or
3. costs supportive of the Contractor-hired and paid Site Assistant that are not already paid from the evaluation contract, e.g., utilities, furnishings, office space, computer hookups.

Administrative costs will be determined to be ineligible for Departmental support under the set-aside if:

1. Costs would have been necessary for implementation of the Welfare to Work Voucher Program from that site in any case; or
2. costs would pay for evaluation activities other than those agreed upon by the Contractor and the HA (or other appropriate local government entity) in their evaluation agreement.]

HUD recognizes that meaningful experimental evidence on the effects of a complex social program demands first-rate qualitative as well as quantitative research. While quantitative evidence generally makes the most compelling case for the presence and size of intervention effects (or non-effects), some past experiments that have been "high-powered" on the statistical dimension reveal far too little about cross-site intervention in the program or about families' lives to inform policy and program. A nuanced understanding of what the locally-run programs "look like" to implementers as well as families is vital. In addition, a variety of important family and community-level factors that affect program outcomes tend to be better studied through in-depth qualitative interviews, focus groups, and/or participant observation than through close-ended surveys on which statistical analysis is typically based (HUD's Moving to Opportunity demonstration is a case in point). Plus, well-designed and conducted qualitative research that is integrated with quantitative research methods can improve the latter - in terms of data collection content and strategy, analytic plan, and interpretation - over the course of the study. Qualitative research that is not integrated ("sidebar qualitative research") is often illustrative of statistical findings - and helpful as such - but does less to enhance the overall power of the

research design. HUD seeks a careful proposal for qualitative research that is (a) well integrated into the larger research design comprised by the controlled experiment and (b) will be led by experienced qualitative researchers.

### III. OBJECTIVES

HUD will select for this Evaluation IQC a single Contractor with the required qualifications, commitment, expertise, and experience in conceptualizing, organizing and conducting high quality research and evaluations within stringent time constraints related to the systematic evaluation of the Welfare to Work Voucher Program. Tasks will, inter alia, include administration of all aspects of the Welfare to Work Voucher controlled experiment from approximately its 16th month through the end of the contract (e.g., implementation of the experimental design, conduct of case studies, random assignment of participants into the experimental and control groups, participant tracking; development of reports) or specified topical projects (e.g., job retention among participants receiving Welfare to Work Vouchers, levels and character of job-related service provision to those receiving Welfare to Work Vouchers and those not receiving them, housing mobility of those receiving Welfare to Work Vouchers). At any time during a five-year period, HUD may request on short notice that the Contractor organize and implement a study, for instance, to pursue questions posed by the research itself. HUD may also request that the Contractor provide limited assistance to HUD for projects conducted by HUD staff or by other HUD Contractor. The Contractor will be expected to have the capacity to respond promptly with the requisite personnel and resources, and to be able to meet the deadlines established by HUD.

The fundamental question of the evaluation is whether the provision of housing in the form of rental assistance promotes the ability of TANF-eligible families (that is, families who, when initially selected for welfare-to-work voucher assistance, are eligible to receive, are currently receiving, or shall have received within the preceding two years, assistance or services funded under the TANF program) to get and keep employment. The provision of housing could promote employment in at least three ways. One way would be by assuring families that their basic needs for shelter are met and, therefore, that it is feasible and beneficial to invest energy and resources in education and training, activities that foster getting or retaining jobs. A second way would be that rental assistance would free dollars to meet the expenses incurred in making the trip to work. A third would be that such assistance would permit families to move closer to where jobs are, thereby encouraging the obtaining or retention of employment. Through this controlled experiment, the Department proposes to test the effect of the offer and use of Welfare to Work Vouchers, supplemented by the provision of specialized services to those receiving such vouchers, on the income, earnings and mobility of participating families.

The controlled experiment will take place in nine sites selected among the HAS selected to receive Welfare to Work Vouchers. The HAS participating in the evaluation will be chosen from those selectees who have requested at least 450 vouchers and who have volunteered to

participate in the evaluation. Among the considerations in making that choice will be geographic diversity and HA capacity and commitment.

All controlled experiments are designed to randomize the effects of all possible variables other than the treatment. As noted above, the Welfare to Work Voucher Program poses particularly difficult challenges to this expectation, but two challenges are especially worthy of note. The first is that the Department cannot and will not prohibit participants who are on the Section 8 waiting list but are randomly assigned to the control group (and, therefore, do not receive a Welfare to Work Voucher) from remaining on the waiting list and thereby prospectively being offered a regular voucher over the term of the evaluation. In other words, the treatment (another form of housing voucher) will not always be restricted to the experimental group.

The second challenge is that the other aspect of the treatment, the promise of employment-related services intended to enhance the ability of participants who are recipients of Welfare to Work Vouchers to obtain or retain employment, also cannot be restricted to the experimental group, that is, other than services expressly bound to the reception and use of Welfare to Work Vouchers. Those assigned to design, implement and assess the experiment will be expected to use fully their expertise to meet these challenges.

As indicated above, an existing contract [the Statement of Work for which is attached] with Abt Associates, Inc. provides for set-up of the evaluation and includes selection of evaluation sites, development of strategies for each of those sites on how eligible participants will be assigned either to the experimental or control group, when and how baseline and subsequent tracking documents will be administered, administration of the random assignment procedures and the baseline survey at all sites prepared to proceed, identification of the linkages of project data to the Department's Multifamily Tenant Characteristics System (MTCS) and full documentation of all decisions reached on evaluation set-up, so that the Evaluation Follow-On Task Order can proceed with no confusion and minimum delay. It is expected that the Task Orders assigned under this Indefinite Quantity Contract will subsume all activities required to evaluate the Welfare to Work Voucher Program over the next five years. These activities include continued implementation of all the functions planned in the initial set-up contract, from implementation of the random assignment of participants to administration of the baseline surveys. In addition, these activities will include final analysis and reporting on the results of the evaluation at least at one interim point and at the end of the term of the IQC.

The Contractor for this IQC will work closely with and under the direction of the Government Technical Representative (GTR), or a Government Technical Monitor (GTM), if designated by the GTR, to develop appropriate management plans, prepare clearance materials for review by the Department and, if necessary, by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The Contractor shall also develop research plans and data collection instruments, field surveys,

analyze data, design and implement a large-scale evaluation of a national program using experimental methods, provide HUD with reports and any data that have been collected, and help HUD communicate findings appropriately to program officials, HUD's customers, or other audiences. Task Order 1 offers a tangible illustration of the functions that will be necessary as part of this IQC. Whether or not data analysis and reports are required for a specific task, it is necessary for the Contractor and relevant subcontractors to have in place strong and extensive capacity to analyze data because this capacity is deemed essential for completing other aspects of research. Consequently, appropriate personnel and resources must be readily accessible and made available to respond promptly to Departmental requests.

#### IV. STATEMENT OF WORK

##### A. General Contract Requirements

The Contractor(s) shall maintain regular, frequent, and responsive contact with the GTR at all times during the completion of tasks to assure that HUD's needs are met effectively, efficiently, and within time and budget. If requested by HUD, the Contractor(s) shall permit the GTR or the GTM to observe any or all phases of the task orders issued under the contract. Upon completing each task order, the Contractor(s) shall provide HUD with copies of materials used or generated to complete the work. All written submissions shall be made available to the GTR in hard copy and electronic format, with text in a format readable by Microsoft Word, and data and documentation as specified in "Guidelines for Delivery of Data Files."

The Contractor(s) shall coordinate with the GTR to develop the appropriate documents, including but not limited to, management plans, monitoring plans, data collection forms, systems guides, record keeping and data flow plans, analysis plans, reports, briefing submissions, data collection plans and instruments, and materials to be submitted to OMB. The Contractor(s) shall be responsible for planning and attending meetings, including orientation meetings, conferences and any other meetings deemed necessary.

The approval of the Contracting Officer shall be obtained in writing before work is begun on tasks. The Contractor(s) shall provide all professional, technical, and clerical personnel and services, materials, equipment, and facilities, and shall otherwise do all things necessary for, or incidental to, performing the task orders.

##### B. Specific Contract Requirements

The Contractor(s) shall perform, but not be limited to, the following tasks in accordance with the objective and general scope of the contract and the individual requirements of each Task Order. The Contractor must obtain the approval from the GTR of the results and/or products of each task before such results and/or products of each task may be used in subsequent stages of a Task Order. Unless

otherwise noted, the GTR will notify the Contractor of HUD's appraisal following its submission. The Contractor shall modify the product, if required, to conform with the results of HUD's review and resubmit the product to the GTR for approval.

#### C. Scope of Work

Under any Task Order in this contract, the Contractor may be asked to perform one or more tasks similar to the following:

- " Implementing all remaining aspects of the evaluation, among them, implementing random assignment of participants to experimental and control groups; designing and administering baseline and follow-up survey instruments; providing technical assistance to HAs on all aspects of the execution of the evaluation; and designing and implementing tracking procedures and documents that maximize the proportion of initial participants in both the experimental and control groups who are surveyed throughout the term of the evaluation;

- " Consulting and cooperating with the contractor responsible for the set-up contract on transfer of all relevant information and knowledge;

- " Developing research, evaluation, policy analysis, performance measurement (including lease-up rates), and/or monitoring methodologies at conceptual and applied levels and matching records of families in the demonstration against administrative data files of state and local agencies, under appropriate privacy commitments, and using those matches to develop outcome measures;

- " Completing all aspects of data collection, including developing survey instruments, preparing OMB clearance packages, and conducting telephone, mail, Internet, and/or on-site data collection and applying quality control and data checking procedures. Research approaches may also include ethnographic research, case studies, or focus groups;

- " Manipulating and analyzing large administrative data sets, including, but not limited to, HUD program data systems and HUD data bases developed for research purposes;

- " Processing data in personal computer environments, including on Local Area Networks, and in mainframe UNISYS and IBM-compatible environments; and transferring information across computer platforms. Using Intranet, Internet, and other methods, to make data and reports available effectively to HUD field offices and HUD's clients, or to solicit information from entities at remote locations. (The GTR will assure coordination, where necessary, of the Contractor's data processing or dissemination with HUD's computer operations staff and other IT units.);

- " Preparing and generating clean, fully documented databases ready for HUD's use either from primary data collection activities or from secondary data sources;

- " Conducting statistical analyses ranging in sophistication from simple cross tabulations to multivariate and econometric analyses;
- " Developing indicators that are relevant to policy, programs, or budgeting from raw data;
- " Conducting qualitative studies, including ethnographic fieldwork, unstructured interviews, and focus groups;
- " Evaluating and synthesizing research results at both technical and policy levels;
- " Reviewing and summarizing relevant research and evaluation literature relating to identified topics relevant to Welfare to Work Vouchers;
- " Producing technical and non-technical reports and communicating findings to Federal, State, and local government officials, HUD customers, and other key audiences in the private and nonprofit sectors nationwide. Disseminating information through various media, including print and Internet; and
- " Designing and conducting policy briefings, research conferences, planning sessions, and seminars.

#### D. Generic Tasks

Contractor shall have the capacity to respond promptly to the issuance of task orders with the requisite personnel and resources, and shall meet deadlines established by HUD. It is expected that HUD will issue Task Orders at any time for the duration of the contract. The GTR or GTM will provide technical monitoring and guidance on all work performed under Task Orders. The Contractor is expected to have the capacity to respond promptly to these requests with the requisite personnel and resources, and to be able to meet deadlines established by HUD. Where Contractor staff are supplemented by subcontractors or consultants, the Contractor must assure that the work of such personnel be fully accountable, responsive, and integrated into the Contractor's management framework.

Upon issuance of each Task Order, the Contractor(s) may be required to perform work similar to the generic individual tasks listed below:

##### Task 1 Orientation

As specified in individual Task Orders, the Task Order Project Director and other key Contractor staff shall attend a meeting at HUD Headquarters or participate in a conference call for the purpose of discussing the requirements of the IQC Contract and going over all deliverables of both the IQC Contract and Task Order 1.

##### Task 2 Management and Work Plan

For each specific Task Order, the Contractor shall prepare and



submit a detailed baseline Management and Work Plan (MWP) that shall govern the performance of all requested services. Using HUD Form 441.1 or alternative method approved by the GTR, the Contractor shall provide a detailed allocation of contract resources and a schedule for accomplishing the contract work. In the MWP, the Contractor shall also identify and allocate total person-hours and the key personnel needed for each task for each month of the contract period.

The MWP shall identify start dates, completion dates, and other major milestones for each task and subtask of the Task Order. Where there are interdependencies among the tasks, the MWP shall indicate the relationship between one task and another. The MWP shall also include a comprehensive narrative of the overall flow of the work and how each task will be accomplished, and shall relate this description to the allocation of staff and other resources.

The GTR will inform the Contractor of HUD's approval of the MWP, or of any needed changes. The Contractors shall modify and resubmit the plan based on HUD's comments.

The plan may be updated from time to time, as directed and approved by the GTR, to reflect approved changes during the progress of the Task Order. In particular, an updated management and work plan shall be provided in the event there is a modification of the Task Order or a re-allocation of resources within the existing scope, budget, or overall time of completion. Where changes affect the scope of work, budget, or overall time of completion, such changes must be directed to the Contracting Officer to modify the task order accordingly.

Monthly progress reports shall be submitted to the GTR, using HUD status report form 661.1 or alternative method approved by the GTR, and a narrative summary of accomplishments and discussions of any deviations (including how deviations affect the project, and what the Contractor recommends for handling the deviation) from the initial schedule of progress.

### Task 3 Analysis Design and Data Collection Plan

As requested in a specific Task Order, the Contractor shall prepare and submit to the GTR for approval, an Analysis Design and Data Collection Plan (ADDCP) for accomplishing the work required by the individual Task Order. As appropriate, the ADDCP shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- (1) Description of the framework for the entire task order;
- (2) Description of the issues and hypothesis;
- (3) Description of the data required to address the issues. To the extent feasible the Contractor shall make use of the data currently available within the Department's information systems and/or other existing data bases. However, if the Contractor proposes to use surveys to collect original data, then the Contractor shall include in the ADDCP the strategy for designing, pre-testing, collecting,

and analyzing the data. The Contractor is responsible for pre-testing and preparing for final form all original interview schedules and data collection forms that shall be used in the collection of data. If the Contractor plans to use information collection methods that require OMB and Privacy Act clearance, the Contractor shall be responsible for preparing the required clearance package that justifies the use of the survey or data collection instrument and the specific data elements;

(4) Description of the sources from which the data will be collected. Should there be sampling, the ADDCP shall discuss sample selection procedures and sample size. The Contractor shall also include a plan for acquiring, cleaning, processing, and documenting that data from all sources. The Contractor shall organize the data into database files, utilizing IBM-compatible microcomputer systems consistent with hardware/software adopted by HUD. Guidelines for the preparation of the database files are provided elsewhere in this package. The Contractor shall develop systems to validate the accuracy of the data collected, and shall fully document all database files. The GTR must approve all database file designs and systems. The Contractor is responsible for developing the data collection activities and documents, pretesting them, training data collectors, and implementing data collection;

(5) Work plan for acquiring data from all sources; and

(6) Description of the methodologies and all analytical approaches and techniques to be used and an explanation of how the data collected will be presented in the reports, and a listing of the reports including a table of contents.

The GTR will provide the Contractor with access to pertinent data available to HUD that may be required to perform individual Task Orders.

#### Task 4 Conduct Work

Consistent with the individual Task Order Scope of Work, Management Work Plan, and Analysis and Data Collection Plan, the Contractor(s) shall conduct the activities to ensure that the Task Order objectives are achieved.

#### Task 5 Seminars, Conferences, and Focus Groups

The Contractor may be required by specific Task Orders to assist the Department in conducting seminars, conferences, or focus groups relating to research and policy issues. Such seminars or conferences may require participation of outside experts or consultants which shall be arranged by the Contractor.

#### Task 6 Work Products and Work Dissemination

The Contractor shall prepare work products consistent with the requirements in the individual Task Orders and shall deliver them to the GTR on the dates specified therein. Draft versions of all products shall be submitted for HUD review, comment, and approval.

HUD's review will address the technical quality of the work, the accuracy of the calculations or analyses, the appropriateness of the methodology, and the adequacy of the support for the findings.

For individual Task Orders, the GTR may ask the Contractor to conduct seminars, conferences, or oral presentations, or furnish written guidance in connection with work accomplished, for Federal, State or local officials, staff of nonprofit organizations, housing industry representatives, or others, including other contractors selected under this procurement. The Contractor responsible for the individual work product may also be responsible for organizing its dissemination, including providing guidance for its use. The Contractor may be required to make research findings, data, or other work products available by Internet.

Upon completing each task order, the Contractor shall provide HUD with copies of materials used or generated to complete the work. All reports and other written submissions shall be made available to the GTR in hard copy and electronic format, with text in a format readable by Microsoft Word, and data and documentation as specified in "Guidelines for Delivery of Data Files" as specified in each individual Task Order.

Interim and final data sets shall be made available for inspection and analysis, as requested by the GTR. All data sets shall be made available in a form that is accessible to HUD in accordance with "Guidelines for the Preparation of Data Files under PD&R Funded Research" as specified in each individual Task Order.

## SECTION D - PACKAGING AND MARKING

## D.1 AS 501 ENVIRONMENTALLY SAFE PACKAGING (NOV 1997)

The offeror or contractor shall package non-breakable deliverables (reports, proposals, studies, etc.) using environmentally safe packaging materials (e.g., recycled paper). The packaging methods shall be in accordance with the best commercial practices and provide adequate protection during shipping and handling.

## SECTION E - INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

## E.1 NOTICE LISTING CONTRACT CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

The following contract clauses pertinent to this section are hereby incorporated by reference (by Citation Number, Title, and Date) in accordance with the clause at FAR "52.252-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE" in Section I of this contract. See FAR 52.252-2 for an internet address (if specified) for electronic access to the full text of a clause.

<http://www.arnet.gov/far/>  
<http://www.hud.gov:80/cts/ctshudar.html>

NUMBER	TITLE	DATE
52.246-9	INSPECTION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (SHORT FORM)	APR 1984
2452.246-70	INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE	APR 1984

## SECTION F - DELIVERIES OR PERFORMANCE

## F.1 NOTICE LISTING CONTRACT CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

The following contract clauses pertinent to this section are hereby incorporated by reference (by Citation Number, Title, and Date) in accordance with the clause at FAR "52.252-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE" in Section I of this contract. See FAR 52.252-2 for an internet address (if specified) for electronic access to the full text of a clause.

NUMBER	TITLE	DATE
52.242-15	STOP-WORK ORDER ALTERNATE I (APR 1984)	AUG 1989
52.247-34	F.O.B. DESTINATION	NOV 1991

## F.2 HUDAR 2452.211-70 CONTRACT PERIOD (APR 1984)

The Contractor shall complete all work hereunder, including delivery of the final report, if required, within 60 months from the effective date of the contract.

## F.3 PRODUCTS/DELIVERABLES SUBMITTED TO HUD

Typically, the contractor will provide the Government Technical Representative (GTR) a management and work plan report within two weeks of receipt of a Notice to proceed. Each task order will indicate a specific date for the submission of the report, as well as dates for other reports (e.g. Research Design and Analysis Plan) required by task order. The contractor will also provide monthly progress reports to the GTR (1 copy) and to PD&R Office of Budget, Contracts and Program Control (1 copy) of the following: a) a narrative progress statement not to exceed three pages b) cost statements, HUD 661.1.

Drafts of technical reports will be submitted to the GTR (and Government Technical Manager (GTM) as appropriate). Specific dates for submitting draft reports will be included in task orders. After review and comment by the GTR (and GTM as appropriate) a final report will be submitted within one month.

## SECTION G - CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION DATA

## G.1 AS 1102 ORDERING PROCEDURES

(a) Orders issued under this contract may be placed via telephone or by facsimile (fax) machine. Telephone and fax orders will be confirmed by an original written order within 15 calendar days.

(b) In addition to the Contracting Officer, the following individuals are authorized to issue orders under this contract:

(c) This contract provides for the issuance of completion type task orders (see FAR 16.306). Such orders shall be issued on a negotiated basis as follows--

(1) The ordering official will provide the contractor with a statement of work, or task description, and a request for the contractor's task order proposal. The contractor shall provide all information requested (e.g., proposed staffing, plan for completing the task, etc.) and cost/price within 15 calendar days, or whatever timeframe determined by the Contracting Officer. Failure to provide all the requested information on time may result in the contractor not being considered or selected for issuance of the order.

(2) The Contracting Officer may conduct discussions and negotiations with the contractor to reach a mutually acceptable technical approach and/or total cost or price for the task order.

(3) The task order shall be executed by the contractor and the Contracting Officer.

## SECTION H - SPECIAL CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS

## H.1 NOTICE LISTING CONTRACT CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

The following contract clauses pertinent to this section are hereby incorporated by reference (by Citation Number, Title, and Date) in accordance with the clause at FAR "52.252-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE" in Section I of this contract. See FAR 52.252-2 for an internet address (if specified) for electronic access to the full text of a clause.

NUMBER	TITLE	DATE
--------	-------	------

## H.2 NOTICE LISTING CONTRACT CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

The following contract clauses pertinent to this section are hereby incorporated by reference (by Citation Number, Title, and Date) in accordance with the clause at FAR "52.252-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE" in Section I of this contract. See FAR 52.252-2 for an internet address (if specified) for electronic access to the full text of a clause.

2452.239-71	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY VIRUS SECURITY	FEB 2000
-------------	---------------------------------------	----------



## PART II - CONTRACT CLAUSES

## SECTION I - CONTRACT CLAUSES

## I.1 NOTICE LISTING CONTRACT CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

The following contract clauses pertinent to this section are hereby incorporated by reference (by Citation Number, Title, and Date) in accordance with the clause at FAR "52.252-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE" in Section I of this contract. See FAR 52.252-2 for an internet address (if specified) for electronic access to the full text of a clause.

NUMBER	TITLE	DATE
52.202-1	DEFINITIONS	OCT 1995
52.203-3	GRATUITIES	APR 1984
52.203-5	COVENANT AGAINST CONTINGENT FEES	APR 1984
52.203-6	RESTRICTIONS ON SUBCONTRACTOR SALES TO THE GOVERNMENT	JUL 1995
52.203-7	ANTI-KICKBACK PROCEDURES	JUL 1995
52.203-8	CANCELLATION, RESCISSION, AND RECOVERY OF FUNDS FOR ILLEGAL OR IMPROPER ACTIVITY	JAN 1997
52.203-10	PRICE OR FEE ADJUSTMENT FOR ILLEGAL OR IMPROPER ACTIVITY	JAN 1997
52.203-12	LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS TO INFLUENCE CERTAIN FEDERAL TRANSACTIONS	JUN 1997
52.204-4	PRINTING/COPYING DOUBLE-SIDED ON RECYCLED PAPER	JUN 1996
52.209-6	PROTECTING THE GOVERNMENT'S INTEREST WHEN SUBCONTRACTING WITH CONTRACTORS DEBARRED, SUSPENDED, OR PROPOSED FOR DEBARMENT	JUL 1995
52.215-2	AUDIT AND RECORDS--NEGOTIATION	JUN 1999
52.215-8	ORDER OF PRECEDENCE--UNIFORM CONTRACT FORMAT	OCT 1997
52.215-10	PRICE REDUCTION FOR DEFECTIVE COST OR PRICING DATA	OCT 1997
52.215-11	PRICE REDUCTION FOR DEFECTIVE COST OR PRICING DATA--MODIFICATIONS	OCT 1997
52.215-12	SUBCONTRACTOR COST OR PRICING DATA	OCT 1997
52.215-13	SUBCONTRACTOR COST OR PRICING DATA--MODIFICATIONS	OCT 1997
52.215-15	PENSION ADJUSTMENTS AND ASSET REVERSIONS (DEC 1998)	DEC 1998
52.215-18	REVERSION OR ADJUSTMENT OF PLANS FOR POSTRETIREMENT BENEFITS OTHER THAN PENSIONS (PRB)	OCT 1997

52.215-19	NOTIFICATION OF OWNERSHIP CHANGES	OCT 1997
52.216-7	ALLOWABLE COST AND PAYMENT	APR 1998
52.216-8	FIXED-FEE	MAR 1997
52.219-4	NOTICE OF PRICE EVALUATION PREFERENCE FOR HUBZONE SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS (JAN 1999)	JAN 1999
52.219-8	UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS	OCT 1999
52.219-9	SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN ALTERNATE II (JAN 1999)	OCT 1999
52.219-16	LIQUIDATED DAMAGES--SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN	JAN 1999
52.219-25	SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION PROGRAM--DISADVANTAGED STATUS AND REPORTING	OCT 1999
52.222-1	NOTICE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF LABOR DISPUTES	FEB 1997
52.222-3	CONVICT LABOR	AUG 1996
52.222-21	PROHIBITION OF SEGREGATED FACILITIES	FEB 1999
52.222-26	EQUAL OPPORTUNITY	FEB 1999
52.222-35	AFFIRMATIVE ACTION FOR DISABLED VETERANS AND VETERANS OF THE VIETNAM ERA	APR 1998
52.222-36	AFFIRMATIVE ACTION FOR WORKERS WITH DISABILITIES	JUN 1998
52.222-37	EMPLOYMENT REPORTS ON DISABLED VETERANS AND VETERANS OF THE VIETNAM ERA	JAN 1999
52.223-2	CLEAN AIR AND WATER	APR 1984
52.223-6	DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE	JAN 1997
52.225-11	RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN FOREIGN PURCHASES	AUG 1998
52.227-1	AUTHORIZATION AND CONSENT ALTERNATE I (APR 1984)	JUL 1995
52.227-2	NOTICE AND ASSISTANCE REGARDING PATENT AND COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT	AUG 1996
52.227-11	PATENT RIGHTS -- RETENTION BY THE CONTRACTOR (SHORT FORM)	JUN 1997
52.228-7	INSURANCE--LIABILITY TO THIRD PERSONS	MAR 1996
52.230-2	COST ACCOUNTING STANDARDS	APR 1998
52.230-6	ADMINISTRATION OF COST ACCOUNTING STANDARDS	APR 1996
52.232-17	INTEREST	JUN 1996
52.232-18	AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS	APR 1984
52.232-22	LIMITATION OF FUNDS	APR 1984
52.232-23	ASSIGNMENT OF CLAIMS	JAN 1986
52.232-25	PROMPT PAYMENT	JUN 1997
52.232-33	PAYMENT BY ELECTRONIC FUNDS--CENTRAL CONTRACTOR REGISTRATION	MAY 1999
52.233-1	DISPUTES	DEC 1998
52.233-3	PROTEST AFTER AWARD ALTERNATE I (JUN 1985)	AUG 1996
52.242-1	NOTICE OF INTENT TO DISALLOW COSTS	APR 1984
52.242-3	PENALTIES FOR UNALLOWABLE COSTS	OCT 1995
52.242-13	BANKRUPTCY	JUL 1995
52.243-2	CHANGES--COST REIMBURSEMENT ALTERNATE V (APR 1984)	AUG 1987

52.244-2	SUBCONTRACTS	AUG 1998
	ALTERNATE II (AUG 1998)	
52.244-5	COMPETITION IN SUBCONTRACTING	DEC 1996
52.246-23	LIMITATION OF LIABILITY	FEB 1997
52.246-25	LIMITATION OF LIABILITY--SERVICES	FEB 1997
52.249-6	TERMINATION (COST-REIMBURSEMENT)	SEP 1996
52.249-14	EXCUSABLE DELAYS	APR 1984
52.253-1	COMPUTER GENERATED FORMS	JAN 1991
2452.203-70	PROHIBITION AGAINST THE USE OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES	DEC 1992
2452.209-72	ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST	APR 1984
2452.216-75	UNPRICED TASK ORDERS	APR 1984
2452.222-70	ACCESSIBILITY OF MEETINGS, CONFERENCES, AND SEMINARS TO PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES	JUL 1988
2452.237-71	REPRODUCTION OF REPORTS	APR 1984
2452.251-70	CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEE TRAVEL	FEB 1987

#### I.2 52.204-1 APPROVAL OF CONTRACT (DEC 1989)

This contract is subject to the written approval of the Contracting Officer, and shall not be binding until so approved.

#### I.3 52.215-21 REQUIREMENTS FOR COST OR PRICING DATA OR INFORMATION OTHER THAN COST OR PRICING DATA-- MODIFICATIONS (OCT 1997)

(a) Exceptions from cost or pricing data. (1) In lieu of submitting cost or pricing data for modifications under this contract, for price adjustments expected to exceed the threshold set forth at FAR 15.403-4 on the date of the agreement on price or the date of the award, whichever is later, the Contractor may submit a written request for exception by submitting the information described in the following subparagraphs. The Contracting Officer may require additional supporting information, but only to the extent necessary to determine whether an exception should be granted, and whether the price is fair and reasonable--

(i) Identification of the law or regulation establishing the price offered. If the price is controlled under law by periodic rulings, reviews, or similar actions of a governmental body, attach a copy of the controlling document, unless it was previously submitted to the contracting office.

(ii) Information on modifications of contracts or subcontracts for commercial items. (A) If--

(1) The original contract or subcontract was granted an exception from cost or pricing data requirements because the price agreed upon was based on adequate price competition or prices set by law or regulation, or was a contract or subcontract for the acquisition of a commercial item; and

(2) The modification (to the contract or subcontract) is not exempted based on one of these exceptions, then the Contractor may provide information to establish that the modification would not change the contract or subcontract from a contract or subcontract for the acquisition of a commercial item to a contract or subcontract for the acquisition of an item other than a commercial item.

(B) For a commercial item exception, the Contractor shall provide, at a minimum, information on prices at which the same item or similar items have previously been sold that is adequate for evaluating the reasonableness of the price of the modification. Such information may include--

(1) For catalog items, a copy of or identification of the catalog and its date, or the appropriate pages for the offered items, or a statement that the catalog is on file in the buying office to which the proposal is being submitted. Provide a copy or describe current discount policies and price lists (published or unpublished), e.g., wholesale, original equipment manufacturer, or reseller. Also explain the basis of each offered price and its relationship to the established catalog price, including how the proposed price relates to the price of recent sales in quantities similar to the proposed quantities.

(2) For market-priced items, the source and date or period of the market quotation or other basis for market price, the base amount, and applicable discounts. In addition, describe the nature of the market.

(3) For items included on an active Federal Supply Service Multiple Award Schedule contract, proof that an exception has been granted for the schedule item.

(4) The Contractor grants the Contracting Officer or an authorized representative the right to examine, at any time before award, books, records, documents, or other directly pertinent records to verify any request for an exception under this clause, and the reasonableness of price. For items priced using catalog or market prices, or law or regulation, access does not extend to cost or profit information or other data relevant solely to the Contractor's determination of the prices to be offered in the catalog or marketplace.

(b) Requirements for cost or pricing data. If the Contractor is not granted an exception from the requirement to submit cost or pricing data, the following applies:

(1) The Contractor shall submit cost or pricing data and supporting attachments in accordance with Table 15-2 of FAR 15.408.

(2) As soon as practicable after agreement on price, but before award (except for unpriced actions), the Contractor shall submit a Certificate of Current Cost or Pricing Data, as prescribed by FAR 15.406-2.

## I.4 52.216-18 ORDERING (OCT 1995)

(a) Any supplies and services to be furnished under this contract shall be ordered by issuance of delivery orders or task orders by the individuals or activities designated in the Schedule. Such orders may be issued from the effective date of the contract through 60 months after contract award.

(b) All delivery orders or task orders are subject to the terms and conditions of this contract. In the event of conflict between a delivery order or task order and this contract, the contract shall control.

(c) If mailed, a delivery order or task order is considered "issued" when the Government deposits the order in the mail. Orders may be issued orally, by facsimile, or by electronic commerce methods only if authorized in the Schedule.

## I.5 52.216-19 ORDER LIMITATIONS (OCT 1995)

(a) Minimum order. When the Government requires supplies or services covered by this contract in an amount of less than \$1,000.00, the Government is not obligated to purchase, nor is the Contractor obligated to furnish, those supplies or services under the contract.

(b) Maximum order. The Contractor is not obligated to honor--

(1) Any order for a single item in excess of \$5,000,000;

(2) Any order for a combination of items in excess of \$5,000,000  
;

(3) A series of orders from the same ordering office within 7 days that together call for quantities exceeding the limitation in subparagraph (b)(1) or (2) above.

(c) If this is a requirements contract (i.e., includes the Requirements clause at subsection 52.216-21 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR)), the Government is not required to order a part of any one requirement from the Contractor if that requirement exceeds the maximum-order limitations in paragraph (b) above.

(d) Notwithstanding paragraphs (b) and (c) above, the Contractor shall honor any order exceeding the maximum order limitations in paragraph (b), unless that order (or orders) is returned to the ordering office within 7 days after issuance, with written notice

stating the Contractor's intent not to ship the item (or items) called for and the reasons. Upon receiving this notice, the Government may acquire the supplies or services from another source.

I.6 52.216-22 INDEFINITE QUANTITY (OCT 1995)

(a) This is an indefinite-quantity contract for the supplies or services specified, and effective for the period stated, in the Schedule. The quantities of supplies and services specified in the Schedule are estimates only and are not purchased by this contract.

(b) Delivery or performance shall be made only as authorized by orders issued in accordance with the Ordering clause. The Contractor shall furnish to the Government, when and if ordered, the supplies or services specified in the Schedule up to and including the quantity designated in the Schedule as the "maximum." The Government shall order at least the quantity of supplies or services designated in the Schedule as the "minimum."

(c) Except for any limitations on quantities in the Order Limitations clause or in the Schedule, there is no limit on the number of orders that may be issued. The Government may issue orders requiring delivery to multiple destinations or performance at multiple locations.

(d) Any order issued during the effective period of this contract and not completed within that period shall be completed by the Contractor within the time specified in the order. The contract shall govern the Contractor's and Government's rights and obligations with respect to that order to the same extent as if the order were completed during the contract's effective period; provided, that the Contractor shall not be required to make any deliveries under this contract after .

I.7 52.217-8 OPTION TO EXTEND SERVICES (NOV 1999)

The Government may require continued performance of any services within the limits and at the rates specified in the contract. These rates may be adjusted only as a result of revisions to prevailing labor rates provided by the Secretary of Labor. The option provision may be exercised more than once, but the total extension of performance hereunder shall not exceed 6 months. The Contracting Officer may exercise the option by written notice to the Contractor within.

## I.8 52.252-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (FEB 1998)

This contract incorporates one or more clauses by reference, with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request, the Contracting Officer will make their full text available. Also, the full text of a clause may be accessed electronically at this/these address(es):

<http://www.arnet.gov/far>

## I.9 HUDAR 2452.237-70 KEY PERSONNEL (OCT 1997)

The personnel specified below are considered to be essential to the work being performed under this contract. Prior to diverting any of the specified individuals to other projects, the Contractor shall notify the Contracting Officer reasonably in advance and shall submit justification (including proposed substitutions) in sufficient detail to permit evaluation of the impact on the program. No diversion shall be made by the Contractor without the written consent of the Contracting Officer: Provided, that the Contracting Officer may ratify in writing such diversion and such ratification shall constitute the consent of the Contracting Officer required by this clause. This clause may be amended from time to time during the course of the contract to either add or delete personnel, as appropriate.

INDIVIDUAL	POSITION/TITLE
* TO BE DETERMINED UPON CONTRACT AWARD	
** IN ADDITION, KEY PERSONNEL MAY BE IDENTIFIED UNDER EACH	
EACH TASK ORDER ISSUED VIA THIS CONTRACT.	

## I.10 AS 1503 CONSTRUCTIVE ACCEPTANCE (NOV 1997)

In accordance with paragraph (a)(5)(i) of the clause at FAR 52.232-25, Prompt Payment, the constructive acceptance period under this contract is 14 calendar days.

## PART III - LIST OF DOCUMENTS, EXHIBITS AND OTHER ATTACHMENTS

## SECTION J - LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT NUMBER	TITLE	NO. PAGES
1	Welfare to Work Voucher Evaluation Set-Up Task Order Statement of Work	10
2	Implementation of the Welfare-To-Work Voucher Program Evaluation, Evaluation Follow-On Contract, Statement of Work Task Order #1 (offerors must propose on this Task)	7



Welfare-To-Work Voucher Evaluation Set-Up Task Order  
Statement of Work

1. Background. The FY 1999 Appropriations Act for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development (P.L. 105-276) set aside \$283,000,000 of tenant-based assistance to help eligible families make the transition from welfare to work. The demonstration program provides for a competition among public housing authorities (PHA). PHAs are to be selected based "on the need for and quality of the proposed program (including innovative approaches), the extent to which the assistance will be coordinated with welfare reform and welfare to work initiatives, and the extent to which the application demonstrates that tenant-based assistance is critical to the success of assisting eligible families to obtain or retain employment". The Act also provides for a one-percent set-aside for conducting detailed evaluations of the effect of providing assistance under the demonstration. The Department intends to implement the evaluation through an experiment focused on the effect of the provision of housing vouchers on the securing and retention of employment of eligible families in a limited number of sites.

A. Basic Design Considerations and Background. The provision of housing assistance to low-income families helps them to meet an immediate human need. Little is known, though, about the long-term effects, positive or negative, of such assistance on the economic self-sufficiency of families so helped.

It could be argued that all forms of assistance will tend to perpetuate low incomes for recipients; for example, the only possible conclusion from the static version of labor economics is that housing assistance will lower work effort (Khadduri, Shroder, and Steffen, 1998).

In the case of housing, however, it could also be argued that, without some assurance that shelter will be available, recipients will find it hard to maintain long-term commitment to education and training; human capital is generally associated with higher work effort. In addition to human capital effects, it could be argued that portable tenant-based assistance should make it easier for families to move where the jobs are, which often means where rents are higher, and, therefore, that tenant-based housing assistance should raise effective work effort. Congress and the Administration adopted this presumption when they authorized the demonstration this procurement will assess.

The issue is fundamental to housing policy, but there is little research on the subject. PD&R is aware of three relevant publications. Murray (1980) took findings from several sources, imposed a strong functional form assumption on preferences, and calculated small negative effects of public housing on short-term labor supply. Reingold (1997) used Chicago data from the Urban Poverty Family Life Survey and found that inner-city public housing

residents were no less likely to be employed than similar inner-city tenants living in privately-owned units. Ong (1998), on the basis of a special survey in California, reported that paid hours of work among welfare recipients who have certificates or vouchers are significantly higher than among the unassisted, while the work hours of welfare recipients in public housing are not significantly different from the unassisted.

Non-experimental evidence on these points seldom speaks with the same authority as data from a major experiment like the one that HUD intends to begin under this procurement. Murray uses experimental data, but at several steps removed from the demonstrations generating the data. Reingold and Ong use surveys, which inherently cannot control for all the factors affecting selection into housing assistance programs. The assisted differ from the unassisted in ways that are both observed and unobserved by researchers, and differences in behavior that remain after all observable variables are controlled might still be caused by differences in the people using or not using the assistance program, rather than by the program itself. Although Ong tests his conclusions using standard statistical corrections for self-selection, the untestable assumptions required for those corrections may be more stringent than the data can support.

In addition to the studies cited above, various experimental evaluations of training programs or welfare reform programs have revealed that the welfare receipt and/or earnings of sub-groups of persons with Section 8 or public housing assistance often respond differently than do those of the unassisted. However, housing assistance has not been randomly assigned in those experiments; those findings, therefore, do not clarify the relationship between housing assistance and economic self-sufficiency. The intention of this study will be to structure a experimental evaluation so that the impact of tenant-based rental assistance on families' employment, earnings and mobility can be tested. HUD is making use of an experimental, panel design evaluation platform for one other recent demonstration, the Moving to Opportunity Demonstration, information about which can be obtained from HUD USER.

B. The Demonstration. The demonstration initiated under this task order is intended to provide clear experimental evidence on this fundamental issue. The eligible target population consists of families who are currently receiving Transitional Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), or who are currently eligible for TANF, or who have received TANF in the previous two years; in 5 to 9 sites, each awarded at least 450 units under the competition, these families will be randomly assigned to experimental (i.e., assigned a voucher) or control group (i.e., not assigned a voucher) status after the State or local housing authority (HA) determines that tenant-based housing assistance would be critical to these families in successfully obtaining or retaining employment. The experimental group will receive both a housing voucher and supportive services arranged with other agencies at the site of the demonstration. The control group will not receive housing assistance through this demonstration; whether they receive the supportive services or not will depend on the depth of resources

available in the locality. Note that, since the Department cannot assign the provision of supportive services in the same way it can rental assistance, there is the distinct likelihood that both the experimental and the control group will receive services. We understand that this is difficult from an experimental viewpoint, but the level of supportive services a family receives will not be a principal focus in the evaluation. See below.

The contractor's primary role in this procurement is to set the stage so that a subsequent contract can implement effectively the experiment outlined above. [In this regard, this Statement of Work will specify clearly what tasks belong to the set-up contract and what tasks belong to the larger follow-on contract.] That experiment will be carried out for up to nine housing agencies (HA). The follow-on contract would also involve collection of necessary data at baseline; reporting on the process by which the demonstration was implemented by the up to five HAs at up to nine sites; and reporting whether outcomes for the experimental group differ significantly from those of the control group. [Note: Throughout this Statement of Work, the term "contractor" refers to the organization awarded the task order as it implements the task order; "bidder" refers to any of the organizations competing for the task order award.]

The operating hypotheses of the demonstration are:

that adults and children of working age in eligible families who receive vouchers are more likely to obtain or retain employment than are those in eligible families who do not receive vouchers; that the average income of those families will increase as a result; that the quality of the jobs obtained or retained by those who receive vouchers will be greater than those who do not receive vouchers;

that eligible families who receive vouchers are more likely to move to neighborhoods closer to existing or prospective employment, employment training, services or public transportation than are eligible families who do not receive vouchers.

It would not be unprecedented for the final evaluation to determine that outcomes for the treatment group differed from those for controls in some sites and not others. Such cross-site variation might be caused by:

differences in the effectiveness of targeting assistance by HAs;

differences in State welfare reform plans;

differences in participant eligibility;

differences in the nature and strength of local partnerships among agencies responsible for other welfare reform and welfare-to-work initiatives;

differences in the character and effectiveness of supportive services;

differences in the local housing and labor markets;

differences in the employment potential of the local population.

Bidders on this task order will be expected to discuss how baseline data collection might permit responsible interpretation of cross-site variation in the final evaluation.

The contractor on this procurement will be expected to recommend to HUD which Welfare to Work Voucher grantees should serve as experimental sites within the strictures set forth under the Notice of Funding Availability. HUD expects that there will be between 100 and 150 successful applications by HAS for Welfare to Work vouchers; of these, we expect that several dozen might obtain 450 or more vouchers, thereby qualifying as potential experimental sites. HUD has invited HAS to volunteer as experimental sites (see attached Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA)), and has offered to reimburse the reasonable and necessary costs incurred as a result of being an experimental site. In the event that we do not get enough volunteers, HUD may require that any site that has obtained 450 or more vouchers participate in the random-assignment evaluation (as set forth in the NOFA). Bidders will be expected to discuss how they will go about recommending sites for evaluation; they should also discuss how they will recruit likely candidate sites in the event that effort is necessary.

The Contractor will be required to devise work plans that divide the labor and other costs associated with the evaluation between the contractor and the HAS in a manner that will ensure cost-effective, timely, and reliable implementation. The division of labor may vary from one site to another.

The Contractor will be expected to provide for the uniform evaluation of program effects across sites.

HUD expects that this task order will require on the order of 3.5 person-years of effort by the contractor.

C. Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA). The NOFA is attached. It was published in the Federal Register on January 28, 1999. It is also available on the World Wide Web at [www.hudclips.org](http://www.hudclips.org). Contractors are expected to have read the text carefully. All critical elements of the authorizing legislation are incorporated in the NOFA.

D. Basic Proposal. If the bidder considers the schedule of any element of the specific tasks outlined in part 2 of the Statement of Work infeasible with respect to timing but not particularly important for pricing, the bidder should identify that element and assume that the bidder's revised schedule is adopted for purposes of the basic proposal. For pricing the basic proposal, bidders should prepare a budget as though the following assumptions were true:

1. This task order will last 16 months from date of award to completion;

2. The Contractor will participate in the selection of the sites that will participate in the evaluation; the Contractor will review applications from eligible sites, applying criteria to be agreed upon by the Contractor and the Department, of what would make good study sites, and make site recommendations to the Department for approval; although all applications will be submitted either to the local HUD Field Office HUB or to the local HUD Field Office Program Center, the Bidder should presume that final selection of the participating evaluation sites will occur in Washington, D.C.;

3. After site selection has occurred, the Contractor will visit each of the sites to interview participating PHAs and to develop a process, customized by site, if need be, for randomization of assignment of participants to either the control or experimental group. Customization responds to three concerns: How the program defines "needs assistance to get or retain a job; how it structures a waiting list for this assistance; and how HUD, the contractor and the PHA believe it most effective to make the actual assignment to treatment and control groups. During these site visits, Contract staff will also gather baseline qualitative data concerning, for example, the relationship between the PHAs and local public employment agencies. It is expected that informal follow-on with the sites over and above that visit will also be needed;

4. The number of evaluation agencies will be five for purposes of costing only. The bidder should assume that four of these are city agencies, located in Portland, OR; Minneapolis, MN; Memphis, TN; and Denver, CO. The fifth of the evaluation agencies is the housing authority of the State of Illinois, and randomization will occur at four locations in that state.

5. Again, for costing purposes only, in the city agencies, the average sample size (combined experimentals and controls) will be 1,300. In the state agency, the sample size will be 3,500. Each sample includes all those who enroll and complete a baseline survey and are randomly assigned even if they cannot find housing in the 60-120 days the PHA allows; note that, by this standard, there will be many "failures" (similarly, some families assigned to the control group may end up receiving regular Section 8 or other housing assistance); for example, in the Gatreaux experiment, the Department achieved a 25% lease-up rate and nearly 50% for Moving to Opportunity (MTO). The administrators of the experiment, whether the contractor or the PHA, must ensure informed consent, i.e., a signed agreement with each family.

6. (As noted above) If any of the participating communities are ready to select program participants within the one-year term of this contract, then the Contractor must, depending upon the randomization process established for that community, either conduct sufficient training of PHA staff that PHA staff will with consistency assign participants according to the randomization process agreed upon by HUD, the PHA and the Contractor and administer the baseline instrument ; or perform the participant assignment process and administer the baseline instrument itself; It is also assumed that, at the end of the contract term, the contractor for the follow-on contract will assume responsibility to

carry over the assignment process through lease up. [In this regard, the start-up contract should include allocation of resources for the transfer of data and reports to the new contractor; each bidder should price and staff this as part of the proposal.] The Department understands that this consideration poses particularly difficult problems for costing. The reason that this provision cannot be avoided is that the workings of this contract should not be an obstacle to the capacity of HAS to respond expeditiously to the needs of low-income people.

7. Contractor must provide a contract-end report that (1) documents the policies and procedures that have been established in consultation with HUD to respond to generic issues of evaluation program administration; (2) documents the customized policies and procedures for each evaluation site to provide a smooth transition to the follow-on contract; and (3) reports any qualitative or quantitative findings that will provide baseline data for the final evaluation report.

8. Contractor should build into the contract two meetings in Washington, D.C. in addition to the orientation.

Elements 1 through 8 above represent the Department's best assessment of the way the first stage of the Welfare to Work Voucher evaluation should proceed. If you do not share that assessment, you may propose an alternative set of assumptions with a cost proposal reflecting those alternative assumptions. Please be specific concerning with which of the considerations above you disagree and provide detailed and compelling reasons why.

E. Task Order Responsibilities. As part of the present task order, Contractors will be expected to perform the following:

Establish the standards by which experimental cities will be chosen;

Develop a work plan for distribution of responsibilities between PHAs and Contractor(s) for project administration;

Design the randomization process for assignment of participants into experimental and control groups;

Identify the elements of the Department's Multifamily Tenant Characteristic System (MTCS) that will be linked to intake/post-test instrument data and the procedures for gathering MTCS data elements from all the randomly assigned households, including those who are not given vouchers or who are offered vouchers but who fail to lease up;

Establish the procedures for tracking every household assigned to an experimental or control group (including members of the control group who later obtain vouchers and members of the treatment group who fail to lease up); and for gathering needed baseline information from participants over and above what is in MTCS. The Department will assume responsibility for developing and assuring timely clearance of the baseline instrument. The baseline instrument might tap participant information about, for example, education benefits,

employment history and housing history.

Develop a mechanism for allocating funds for administration of the project in the experimental sites;

Participate in review of all NOFA proposals from cities/States with 450 or more vouchers; select the experimental sites;

(If any of the participating communities are ready to select program participants within the one year duration of this contract) Must, depending upon the randomization process established for that community, either conduct sufficient training of PHA staff that PHA staff will with consistency assign participants according to the randomization process agreed upon by HUD, the PHA and the Contractor and administer the baseline instrument ; or perform the participant assignment process and administer the baseline instrument themselves; the Department recognizes that this can be a sizeable cost item, but it is essential that the Welfare-to-Work Voucher evaluation not impede any HA's schedule for getting housing assistance to people with low incomes; note also that the decision whether the HA or the contractor will administer the experiment for a given HA is a joint one between the HA and the contractor.

Draft preliminary report that documents all decisions concerning implementation of the experiment in sufficient detail that the follow-on Welfare to Work Voucher evaluation, or Stage 2, can proceed; this preliminary report should include descriptions of local program design in the experimental sites;

Explain in detail how each decision reached during Stage 1 relates to implementation of the follow-on Welfare to Work Voucher evaluation;

Participate in several meetings with the Task Order GTM at key points in this contract.

F. Relationship of Current Task Order to Second Stage Evaluation. This task order, in effect, sets the stage for the actual implementation of the Welfare to Work Voucher evaluation, which will be competed separately as an Indefinite Quantity Contract at a later date. The tasks that will comprise that effort, and will therefore not be part of this task order, might include, but not be limited to: (1) Administration or monitoring the administration of the post-test instrument; (2) (If necessary) Conducting site visits to experimental sites; (3) Linking voucher intake and tracking information with the Department's MTCS system and performing analysis; (4) Developing data analysis plan; and (5) Performing data analysis and drafting the results in a final report.

In addition, the following responsibilities would be inside the boundaries of this task order only if housing authorities participating in the experiment are ready to assign participants before the term of this task order ends: (1) (If PHAs assign participants to experimental/control groups) Conducting training and monitor performance of PHAs in random assignment of participants; (2) (If contractor assigns participants) Orchestration

of participant selection at multiple sites and perform actual selection; and (3) Administration or monitoring the administration of the intake instrument.

Bidders for this task order should also be assured that they will not have to: (1) Track participants beyond their initial move; (2) gather outcome data on participants other than where they move; (3) gather administrative data on participants other than what is in MTCS (e.g., not employment and earnings data); and (4) report on program outcomes for individuals other than their initial use of Section 8 (e.g., no reporting on services received or employment).

## 2. Specific tasks

A. Orientation. Within one (1) week after the Task Order is executed, the Project Director and other key Contractor personnel shall attend a meeting at HUD Headquarters for the purpose of establishing a common understanding about the contract objective and the scope of work necessary to achieve that objective.

B. Management and Work Plan. The Contractor shall submit a detailed draft Management and Subcontracting Plan to HUD within four (4) weeks of contract award. The final Management and Work Plan shall be submitted within eight (8) weeks of contract award.

The Contractor shall prepare a management and work plan that shall govern the performance of all work under this contract. Using HUD form 441.1 (to be provided by HUD) or its equivalent, the Contractor shall provide a detailed allocation of contract resources and a schedule for accomplishing the substantive work of the contract. The plan also shall identify and allocate total person hours and the key personnel needed for each work task for each month of the contract period.

The plan shall set start dates, completion dates and other major milestones for each task and sub-task. Where tasks are interdependent, the Management Plan shall indicate how the various tasks will relate. The plan also shall include a comprehensive narrative of the overall expected flow of work and how each task will be accomplished, and shall relate this description to the allocation of staff and other resources.

C. Site Selection Recommendations. The Contractor shall propose to PD&R at least five (5) housing agencies that make good candidates for an experimental evaluation. In order to make this recommendation, Contractor shall:

Review all funded NOFA proposals that receive at least 450 vouchers;

Determine from those proposals which agencies represent good potential experimental sites for further consideration; in this regard, the Department will be looking closely at the criteria bidders suggest for site selection; certainly among other considerations, the Department is interested in the quality of local reporting into MTCS; the relative tightness of the MSA employment rate; the presence of entry level jobs in the local labor market;



and the current capacity of the PHA to participate effectively in the experiment.

Conduct discussions with housing agency staff by phone and, if necessary, in person to determine the feasibility of evaluation and, with State housing agencies, about sites in the State that might be subject to the experiment; the Contractor should also consult with the appropriate HUD field staff in making these determinations. The report recommending agencies should include reasons for the recommendations made and provide several alternative sites if agreements cannot be reached with the ones recommended.

The report recommending agencies as evaluation subjects shall be submitted to the GTR within 15 weeks of task order execution, and a final decision on subjects and sites shall be made by PD&R within 19 weeks.

D. Design of experiment, and recommendations on appropriate division of labor. The Contractor shall propose a plan for the conduct of the experiment described in the background sections of this Statement of Work. The plan shall provide in detail for the implementation of experimental procedures and administration of baseline instruments at all five experimental agencies. The plan may have elements that are common to all sites, and elements that are specific to one or two sites; uniformity of procedures across sites is not required. HUD does expect that the experimental design:

- will be cost-effective in the use of Contractor and/or housing agency staff and other resources;

- will ensure integrity of random assignment to treatment and control groups;

- will ensure collection of required data.

The contractor should be aware that assigning households between the experimental and control groups is not necessarily as simple as assigning half of the participants to one group and half to the other. The following are among the considerations that might affect the proportions assigned to each group.

Not all households assigned to the experimental groups will be successful in using a Section 8 voucher to lease a home. Once a participant is assigned to the treatment or the control group, he/she remains in the experiment and his/her results count; for example, in a similar instance, HUD's current Moving to Opportunity (MTO) evaluation achieved less than a 50 percent lease-up, and the outcomes - for those leased up or not - count as part of the evaluation outcomes. Bidders and participating PHAs should understand this and understand also that the random assignment ratios used may need to be changed over the course of the lease-up process.

A draft plan for the experiment shall be submitted to the GTR within 25 weeks of task order execution; the final plan shall be submitted within 28 weeks of task order execution.

E. Site-specific agreements on demonstration procedures and documentation. Upon acceptance of the final plan for the conduct of the experiment, the Contractor shall:

- 1) provide each agency selected with a copy of the plan;
- 2) provide each housing agency with staff time and other resources required of the agency under the plan.

The Contractor will clearly communicate with each agency that the estimates presented are of additional effort required by the implementation of the experimental evaluation over and above the effort required to administer voucher assistance and supportive services that the agency proposed to deliver in its application to HUD for welfare to work vouchers.

Successful negotiation of plan implementation at each agency will be signified by a letter from the Executive Director of the HA to the Assistant Secretary of PD&R agreeing to plan implementation at his or her agency and submission of a budget reflecting the reasonable and necessary costs of the estimated level of effort. This letter shall be accompanied by a letter from the Project Director of the Contractor certifying that the budget submitted by the HA reflects, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, the reasonable and necessary costs of the HA's participation in the evaluation as designed.

The letters just described shall be received from four agencies within 35 weeks, and from all five agencies within 40 weeks, of task order execution.

F. Baseline Instrument Design and OMB Clearance Because the Department understands that OMB clearance of the participant intake instrument might affect the timely implementation of the Welfare to Work Voucher experiment and because an effective intake instrument has already been developed for a related program evaluation, Moving to Opportunity (MTO), the Department will assume responsibility for the timely development and clearance of the intake instrument. The MTO intake instrument is attached. Contractor may be requested to review and comment on the instrument before it is placed into clearance.

G. Training for Relevant Contractor and HA Staff The Contractor shall provide any personnel, whether its own or those of the housing agency, who will be performing tasks related to the experiment on-site, with the necessary training. Because staff turnover is to be expected, the training task is ongoing. However, an initial training session at a central location should be planned if it would be cost-efficient to transport the trainees to one place rather than the trainers to the several sites.

H. Oversight The Contractor shall arrange for regular communication, advice, and oversight on the conduct of the experiment with on-site personnel throughout the term of this task order. In essence, the Contractor must ensure that throughout the

term of the task order everything necessary is done to ensure that participants are enrolled and assigned expeditiously and consistently according to the randomization process agreed upon by HUD, the PHA and the Contractor; that complete and reliable baseline data are collected; and that the process by which local decisions have been made and implemented is sufficiently well documented that the follow-on implementation phase can be carried on without pause or doubt.

The Contractor shall immediately report to the GTM any significant deviation from the plan of the experiment.

I. Task Order-End Report Contractor must provide a contract-end report that (1) documents the policies and procedures that have been established in consultation with HUD to respond to generic issues of evaluation program administration; (2) documents the customized policies and procedures for each evaluation site to provide a smooth transition to the follow-on contract; and (3) reports any qualitative or quantitative findings that will baseline data for the final evaluation report.

In this Report, the Contractor shall also produce a profile of the labor and housing markets at each experimental site and of the employability of the population eligible for the demonstration, using whatever data are readily available, for the purpose of illuminating anticipated cross-site variation in measured experimental effects. The Report should also describe the program of services that PHAs will provide (or ensure provision of) to the treatment group under the program as well as the services generally available to and typically used by both the treatment and control groups.

The draft Task Order-End Report shall be submitted to the GTR within 60 weeks of task order execution; a final report, responding to or incorporating HUD's comments, shall be submitted within 68 weeks of task order execution.

The Contractor shall plan to present briefings summarizing the End Report before two audiences in Washington, D.C.: one consisting of HUD staff only, and one consisting of other persons.

### 3. Schedule of Deliverables\*

The overall contract award will be for 68 weeks.

Task	Accomplishments	Weeks	After Award
1	Orientation	1	
2	Management and Work Plan - Draft	4	
	Management and Work Plan - Final	8	
3	Site Selection Recommendations-Report	15	
	Site Selection - Final Decision	19	
4	Experimental Design - Draft	25	

	Experimental Design - Final	28
5	Site-Specific Agreements	40
6	Task Order-End Report - Draft	60
	Task Order-End Report - Final	68

\*Offerors are invited to propose modifications to this suggested schedule.

Task Order 1: Implementation of the Welfare-To-Work Voucher  
Program Evaluation, Evaluation Follow-On Contract Statement of Work

1. Background

The FY 1999 Appropriations Act for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development (P.L. 105-276) set aside \$283,000,000 of Section 8 tenant-based assistance to help eligible families make the transition from welfare to work. The Welfare to Work Voucher program provides for a competition among public housing agencies (HA). (Congress also set aside program vouchers for eight communities). HAs are to be selected based "on the need for and quality of the proposed program (including innovative approaches), the extent to which the assistance will be coordinated with welfare reform and welfare to work initiatives, and the extent to which the application demonstrates that tenant-based assistance is critical to the success of assisting eligible families to obtain or retain employment". The Act also provides for a one-percent set-aside for conducting detailed evaluations of the effect of providing assistance under the program. The Department intends to implement this evaluation through an experiment focused on the effect of the provision of housing vouchers on the securing and retention of employment of eligible families in a limited number of sites. This is Task Order 1 of the Welfare to Work Voucher IQC. As indicated in Section C of the IQC Statement of Work and below, this task order will implement the experiment described above and set in place through a preceding task order, awarded to Abt Associates, Inc. The Statement of Work for that preceding task order is attached as well as the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the Welfare to Work Voucher competition that was published in the Federal Register on January 28, 1999. HUD expects that this task order will require on the order of 5 ½ person- years of effort by the contractor.

A. Basic Proposal For pricing the basic proposal, bidders should prepare a budget using the following assumptions:

1. This task order will last 14 months from date of award to completion;

2. The number of evaluation agencies will be nine for purposes of costing: Atlanta, GA; Augusta, GA; Boston and Springfield, MA, as sites under award to the Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development; Fresno City and Fresno County, CA; Houston, TX; Los Angeles City and County, CA; Spokane, WA. 3. Again, for costing purposes, the average sample size (combined experimentals and controls) will be 1,320. Each sample includes all those who enroll and complete a baseline survey and are randomly assigned even if they cannot find housing in the 60-120 days the PHA allows; note that, by this standard, there will be a number of "failures"(similarly, some families assigned to the control group may end up receiving regular Section 8 or other housing assistance); for example, the Department achieved a final lease-up rate of 60 percent among the Section 8 control group in the Moving to Opportunity (MTO) demonstration. The administrators of this

experiment, whether the Contractor or the PHA, must ensure informed consent, i.e., a signed agreement with each family. 4. For costing purposes, offerors should assume that site selection has already occurred; a customized plan for implementation of the evaluation in the participating communities has already been developed and agreed upon by the relevant HA, HUD and the Contractor of the Evaluation Set-Up Contract at all sites and that initial random assignment and baseline survey administration has begun at all sites and been completed at three sites; that every household assigned to an experimental or control group during the term of this task order will be tracked at regular intervals; that a site assistant responsible for day-to-day administration of the evaluation will have been hired by the Contractor out of the Evaluation Contract for each of the sites; and that the site assistant will remain under contract until initial lease-up is complete.

5. Contractor must provide an interim report that (a) reports the current status of the evaluation at each of the experimental sites; (b) offers descriptive data about all project participants, including both those in the experimental and control; and © provides analysis of whatever program outcome information is available at this interim stage of the evaluation.

6. Contractor should build into the contract one meeting in Washington, D.C. in addition to the orientation session.

Elements 1 through 6 above represent the Department's best assessment of the way the implementation stage of the Welfare to Work Voucher evaluation should proceed through initial lease-up and the end of Task Order 1. If the offeror does not agree with this assessment, the offeror shall propose an alternative set of assumptions with a cost proposal reflecting those alternative assumptions. The offeror shall specify with which of the considerations above it disagrees and shall provide detailed, compelling reasons why. Also the offeror should be aware that, since this task order represents a follow-on to an existing setup contract, substantial deviation from the Department's assessment demands an exceptionally compelling argument.

B. Tasks Already Performed as Part of the Evaluation Set-up Contract As part of an existing contract, the following tasks are currently being or will presently be performed, and, thus, will not be part of the present task order. The criteria by which experimental cities will be chosen have been established.

The experimental sites will have been chosen based on review of all submissions from HAs that receive 450 or more vouchers and who volunteered to participate in the application;

A work plan for distribution of responsibilities between HAs and Contractor(s) for project administration at each of the experimental sites will have been developed; as part of this effort, a description of the existing structures and local preferences concerning such matters as outreach, the structure of and responsibility for random assignment and the administration of baseline and follow-on surveys will have been produced;

A randomization process for assignment of participants into

experimental and control groups will have been developed at each site; the process of client flow will have been designed to maximize the integrity of the randomization process and to accommodate to the degree possible local HA practices and preferences;

The elements of the Department's Multifamily Tenant Characteristic System (MTCS) that will be linked to intake/post-test instrument data and the procedures for gathering selected MTCS data elements from all the randomly assigned households, including those who are not given vouchers or who are offered vouchers but who fail to lease up, will have been identified; linkages with other sources of data, e.g., earnings information and training program participation, will have been scoped out;

Procedures and forms for tracking every household assigned to an experimental or control group (including members of the control group who later obtain vouchers and either lease up or fail to lease up and members of the treatment group who fail to lease up); and for gathering needed baseline information from participants over and above what is in MTCS will have been developed. The baseline instrument collects participant information such as education attainment, income, employment history and housing history. A copy of the draft baseline survey submitted to OMB for clearance is attached. The principal participant tracking procedures, including an instrument to identify services received and the frequency of that reception and a means to identify rapidly whether members of the control group have received vouchers other than Welfare to Work Vouchers, will have been scoped out.

HUD considers it likely that all of the experimental communities will be ready to select program participants within the term (16 months starting in August 1999) of the existing project set-up contract and that most if not all will have begun in the first half of calendar year 2000. In the event that a HA is ready, the Contractor for the evaluation set-up contract has been instructed, based on the randomization process customized to the needs and capacity of each community, either to conduct sufficient training of HA staff that HA staff will consistently assign participants according to a protocol agreed upon by HUD, the HA and the Contractor and administer the baseline instrument: or perform the participant assignment process and administer the baseline instrument itself. In all instances HAs have agreed to permit a Contractor- hired site assistant perform the major evaluation-related functions.

Processes and documents that will guarantee a smooth transition from the existing Evaluation Set-Up Contract to the first task order described in this Statement of Work will be in place. All decisions already reached affecting implementation of the experiment will be documented in sufficient detail that the Follow-On Evaluation can proceed without confusion or delay; documentation will include at least a clear definition of tasks accomplished and tasks to be completed; mapping of activities accomplished; descriptions of local program design in the experimental sites, including documentation of local computer capacity.

C. Tasks to be Accomplished under the Welfare to Work Voucher Evaluation Follow-On Contract

The following tasks comprise the substance of Task Order 1: 1. The Contractor shall ensure continuity between the tasks undertaken in Stage 1 (the Evaluation Set-Up Contract) and the tasks to be undertaken under this task order. For the implementation of the Evaluation Follow-On Contract, this means that organizational capacity and commitment to continue every aspect of project implementation without delay and studious attention to detail are essential to project success. The Department for its part will structure the term of the follow-on contract so that there is sufficient overlap that a complete and harmonious link of the two contracts into a single research effort can be accomplished.

2. It is anticipated that the work plan by which random assignment will take place will already been established in all the experimental sites by the beginning of this task order. However, it there should be an instance in which it has not been developed, the Contractor should ensure that such a customized work plan will have been completed in consultation with the HA.

3. For those sites in which random assignment has not yet been completed, conduct or monitor random assignment of participants to the experimental and control groups and implement or ensure the implementation of the baseline instrument; in this regard, the bidder should plan to budget the employment of contract staff as local site assistants, who would carry out random assignment and assure the integrity of the experiment. Among the functions performed by the local site assistants would be to train regular HA staff if they are assisting in any evaluation-related function, carry out random assignment, collect baseline data, track participant flow and in other ways assist the site agencies with implementing the evaluation.

4. As indicated above, the baseline survey instrument has already been developed and has been cleared by OMB. The baseline survey will serve as a template for whatever post-test survey documents are necessary, although the post-test document will most likely be shorter and may need to be modified to accommodate what has been learned through administration of the baseline survey. The Contractor for this task order will modify the baseline survey document (and ensure OMB clearance) for use as a post-test document, or, alternatively, develop a new post-test document or some combination of a detailed, infrequently administered post-test document with small regularly administered tracking documents. The Contractor will determine the frequency of and administer the post-test and/or tracking documents.

5. Link voucher intake and tracking information with the Department's MTCS system and other relevant existing data on earnings and income and perform analysis.

6. Track all households assigned to an experimental or control group and due to be tracked within the term of this task order.



Tracking information should include all changes in employment status, position, wages, income, benefits and employer; housing status and location; service use and frequency; and other program outcomes.

7. Develop and implement a strategy to "count" supportive services provided to both the experimental and control groups.

8. Conduct site visits (as necessary) to experimental sites to ensure that random assignment procedures are being carried out according to the agreed upon protocols and perform any qualitative analysis needed to place experimental findings firmly within a local setting.

9. Develop a data analysis plan for the Interim Report. By the end date of this task order, many of the sites will have been allocating Welfare to Work Vouchers for at least a year and one-half, and the majority of the units are likely to have been leased up for a year or more. Under the circumstances, we would expect the offeror to be able to describe local strategies and processes for implementing the Welfare to Work Voucher Program and analyze the characteristics of program beneficiaries and program outcomes at an interim stage in program implementation.

10. Perform data analysis and draft the results into an Interim Report that covers the period from program initiation through the end of this task order. As noted above, any data collected during the Evaluation Set-Up Contract (e.g., site-by-site descriptions, baseline data) that would contribute to this report must have been turned over to the contractor of the Evaluation Follow-On Contract before the earlier contract terminates.

## 2. Specific tasks

A. Orientation Within one (1) week after the Task Order is executed, the Project Director and other key Contractor personnel shall attend a meeting at HUD Headquarters for the purpose of discussing the requirements of the Contract and going over all reports and deliverables of both the IQC Contract and Task Order 1.

B. Transfer of Responsibility between Contracts This contract builds in a period of (8) weeks from Task Order execution in which the previous set-up contract and this Task Order run concurrently. This overlap is meant to assure an orderly transition from the Evaluation Set-Up Contract to the Evaluation Follow-On Contract, especially but not solely in the eventuality that two different contractors are performing the two tasks. During that interval, the appropriate staff for this task order shall meet with staff assigned to the evaluation set-up task order and assure that all information, materials, agreements and reports that comprise the work product of the set-up contract have been transferred to the Evaluation Follow-On Task Order Contractor, so that a complete and orderly transition to the follow-on contract can proceed. The Management and Work Plan (C below) should document what has been transferred and should certify that documentation is complete and satisfactory. The Contractor for the evaluation set-up contract was charged with

performing all the tasks necessary to get the program and the evaluation off the ground at those sites ready to conduct random assignment and distribute the Welfare to Work Vouchers. In those instances, the Contractor for Task Order 1 shall continue those functions with as little disruption as possible. If there are situations in which a PHA is ready to begin just as this contract begins, the Contractor should make every effort to assure that the legitimacy of the controlled experiment is maintained and the PHA is able to begin as soon as possible.

C. Management and Work Plan The Contractor shall submit a detailed draft Management and Work Plan to HUD within twelve (12) weeks of contract award. The final Management and Work Plan shall be submitted within fourteen (14) weeks of contract award. The Management and Work Plan shall govern the performance of all work under this contract. Using HUD form 441.1 (to be provided by HUD) or its equivalent, the Contractor shall provide a detailed allocation of contract resources and a schedule for accomplishing the substantive work of the contract. The plan also shall identify and allocate total person hours and the key personnel needed for each work task for each month of the contract period. The plan shall set start dates, completion dates and other major milestones for each task and sub-task. Where tasks are interdependent, the Management Plan shall indicate how the various tasks will relate. The plan also shall include a comprehensive narrative of the overall expected flow of work and how each task will be accomplished, and shall relate this description to the allocation of staff and other resources.

D. Site-Specific Schedule for Implementation of Evaluation The Contractor shall propose a schedule for the conduct of the controlled experiment through the end of this task order. The schedule shall provide in detail for the implementation of experimental procedures and administration of baseline instruments at all nine HAS participating in the evaluation. The plan may have elements that are common to all sites and elements that are specific to one or two sites; uniformity of procedures across sites is not required. HUD does expect that the proposed schedule: will be cost-effective in the use of Contractor and/or housing agency staff and other resources; will ensure integrity of random assignment to treatment and control groups; will ensure collection of required data.

The schedule should be based in part on the presumption that initial lease-up in all experimental communities should be accomplished within one year of the announcement of awards for the Welfare to Work Voucher competition. A final schedule for implementation of the experiment shall be submitted to the GTR within 16 weeks of task order execution.

E. Development of Participant Tracking and Status Documents The Contractor shall submit drafts of all tracking and status documents for Department comment. If the Contractor determines that a document other than the baseline survey should be used for periodic survey of program participants, then the Contractor shall build OMB clearance procedures into its Work Plan in such a way that there are

no delays produced by administration of the follow-on surveys.

F. Oversight The Contractor shall arrange for regular communication, advice, and oversight on the conduct of the experiment with on-site personnel throughout the term of this task order. In essence, the Contractor must ensure that throughout the term of the task order everything necessary is done to ensure that participants are enrolled and assigned expeditiously and consistently according to the randomization process agreed upon by HUD, the PHA and the Contractor; that complete and reliable baseline and status and tracking data, as appropriate, are collected; and that the process by which local decisions have been made and implemented is sufficiently well documented that subsequent task orders performed out of this Indefinite Quantity Contract can be carried on without pause or doubt. The Contractor shall immediately report to the GTM any significant deviation from the schedule of the experiment. The GTM will ensure that the GTR and Contract Officer are notified.

G. Interim Report Contractor shall provide an interim report that (1) reports the current status of the evaluation at each of the experimental sites; (2) offers descriptive data about all project participants, including both those in the experimental and control groups; (3) provides any impact analysis that can be accomplished at this relatively early stage in the evaluation; and (4) provides sufficient documentation of the decisions and events at each site that a smooth transition can be assured between Task Order 1 and subsequent task orders. The draft Interim Report shall be submitted to the GTR within 56 weeks of task order execution; a final Interim Report, responding to or incorporating HUD's comments, shall be submitted within 60 weeks of task order execution. The Contractor shall plan a briefing before HUD staff in Washington, D.C. summarizing the Interim Report.

### 3. Schedule of Deliverables

The overall contract award for this task order will be for 60 weeks.

Task	Accomplishments	Weeks	
			After Award
1	Orientation	1	
2	Inter-Contract Transfer	8	
3	Management and Work Plan - Draft	12	
	Management and Work Plan - Final	14	
4	Site-Specific Implementation Schedule	16	
5	Participant Tracking & Status Documents - Draft		20
	Participant Tracking & Status Documents - Finals		24
6	Interim Report - Draft	56	
	Interim Report - Final	60	



## PART IV - REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

SECTION K - REPRESENTATIONS, CERTIFICATIONS AND  
OTHER STATEMENTS OF OFFERORSK.1 NOTICE LISTING SOLICITATION PROVISIONS INCORPORATED  
BY REFERENCE

The following solicitation provisions pertinent to this section are hereby incorporated by reference (by Citation Number, Title, and Date) in accordance with the FAR provision at FAR "52.252-1 SOLICITATION PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE" in Section L of this solicitation. See FAR 52.252-1 for an internet address (if specified) for electronic access to the full text of a provision.

NUMBER	TITLE	DATE
52.203-11	CERTIFICATION AND DISCLOSURE REGARDING PAYMENTS TO INFLUENCE CERTAIN FEDERAL TRANSACTIONS	APR 1991

## K.2 52.204-3 TAXPAYER IDENTIFICATION (OCT 1998)

## (a) Definitions.

Common parent, as used in this provision, means that corporate entity that owns or controls an affiliated group of corporations that files its Federal income tax returns on a consolidated basis, and of which the offeror is a member.

Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN), as used in this provision, means the number required by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) to be used by the offeror in reporting income tax and other returns. The TIN may be either a Social Security Number or an Employer Identification Number.

(b) All offerors must submit the information required in paragraphs (d) through (f) of this provision to comply with debt collection requirements of 31 U.S.C. 7701(c) and 3325(d), reporting requirements of 26 U.S.C. 6041, 6041A, and 6050M, and implementing regulations issued by the IRS. If the resulting contract is subject to the payment reporting requirements described in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 4.904, the failure or refusal by the offeror to furnish the information may result in a 31 percent reduction of payments otherwise due under the contract.

(c) The TIN may be used by the Government to collect and report on any delinquent amounts arising out of the offeror's relationship with the Government (31 U.S.C. 7701(c)(3)). If the resulting

contract is subject to the payment reporting requirements described in FAR 4.904, the TIN provided hereunder may be matched with IRS records to verify the accuracy of the offeror's TIN.

(d) Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN).

☐ TIN: . \_\_\_\_\_

☐ TIN has been applied for.

☐ TIN is not required because:

☐ Offeror is a nonresident alien, foreign corporation, or foreign partnership that does not have income effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States and does not have an office or place of business or a fiscal paying agent in the United States;

☐ Offeror is an agency or instrumentality of a foreign government;

☐ Offeror is an agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government.

(e) Type of organization.

☐ Sole proprietorship;

☐ Partnership;

☐ Corporate entity (not tax-exempt);

☐ Corporate entity (tax-exempt);

☐ Government entity (Federal, State, or local);

☐ Foreign government;

☐ International organization per 26 CFR 1.6049-4;

☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

(f) Common parent.

☐ Offeror is not owned or controlled by a common parent as defined in paragraph (a) of this provision.

☐ Name and TIN of common parent:

Name \_\_\_\_\_

TIN \_\_\_\_\_

K.3 52.204-5 WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESS (OTHER THAN SMALL BUSINESS)  
(MAY 1999)

(a) Definition. Women-owned business concern, as used in this provision, means a concern that is at least 51 percent owned by one or more women; or in the case of any publicly owned business, at least 51 percent of its stock is owned by one or more women; and whose management and daily business operations are controlled by one or more women.

(b) Representation. [Complete only if the offeror is a women-owned business concern and has not represented itself as a small business concern in paragraph (b)(1) of FAR 52.219-1, Small Business Program Representations, of this solicitation.] The offeror represents that it [ ] is, [ ] is not a women-owned business concern.

K.4 52.209-5 CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION,  
PROPOSED DEBARMENT, AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS  
(MAR 1996)

(a)(1) The Offeror certifies, to the best of its knowledge and belief, that -

(i) The Offeror and/or any of its Principals -

(A) Are [ ] are not [ ] presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, or declared ineligible for the award of contracts by any Federal agency;

(B) Have [ ] have not [ ], within a 3-year period preceding this offer, been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for: commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, state, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or state antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion or receiving stolen property; and

(C) Are [ ] are not [ ] presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated in subdivision (a)(1)(i)(B) of this provision.

(ii) The Offeror has [ ] has not [ ], within a 3-year period preceding this offer, had one or more contracts terminated for default by any Federal agency.

(2) "Principals," for the purposes of this certification, means

officers; directors; owners; partners; and, persons having primary management or supervisory responsibilities within a business entity (e.g., general manager; plant manager; head of a subsidiary, division, or business segment, and similar positions).

THIS CERTIFICATION CONCERNS A MATTER WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF AN AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE MAKING OF A FALSE, FICTITIOUS, OR FRAUDULENT CERTIFICATION MAY RENDER THE MAKER SUBJECT TO PROSECUTION UNDER SECTION 1001, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.

(b) The Offeror shall provide immediate written notice to the Contracting Officer if, at any time prior to contract award, the Offeror learns that its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.

(c) A certification that any of the items in paragraph (a) of this provision exists will not necessarily result in withholding of an award under this solicitation. However, the certification will be considered in connection with a determination of the Offeror's responsibility. Failure of the Offeror to furnish a certification or provide such additional information as requested by the Contracting Officer may render the Offeror nonresponsible.

(d) Nothing contained in the foregoing shall be construed to require establishment of a system of records in order to render, in good faith, the certification required by paragraph (a) of this provision. The knowledge and information of an Offeror is not required to exceed that which is normally possessed by a prudent person in the ordinary course of business dealings.

(e) The certification in paragraph (a) of this provision is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when making award. If it is later determined that the Offeror knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Government, the Contracting Officer may terminate the contract resulting from this solicitation for default.

#### K.5 52.215-6 PLACE OF PERFORMANCE (OCT 1997)

(a) The offeror or respondent, in the performance of any contract resulting from this solicitation, [ ] intends, [ ] does not intend [check applicable block] to use one or more plants or facilities located at a different address from the address of the offeror or respondent as indicated in this proposal or response to request for information.

(b) If the offeror or respondent checks "intends" in paragraph (a) of this provision, it shall insert in the following spaces the required information:

---

Place of performance (street (street address, city, state,	Name and address of owner and operator of the plant or facility
---	--



county, code)	if other than offeror or respondent

K.6 52.219-1 SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAM REPRESENTATIONS  
(OCT 1998)  
ALTERNATE II (NOV 1999)

(a)(1) The standard industrial classification (SIC) code for this acquisition is.

(2) The small business size standard is .

(3) The small business size standard for a concern which submits an offer in its own name, other than on a construction or service contract, but which proposes to furnish a product which it did not itself manufacture, is 500 employees.

(b) Representations. (1) The offeror represents as part of its offer that it [ ] is, [ ] is not a small business concern.

(2) (Complete only if offeror represented itself as a small business concern in paragraph (b)(1) of this provision.) The offeror represents, for general statistical purposes, that it [ ] is, [ ] is not, a small disadvantaged business concern as defined in 13 CFR 124.1002.

(3) (Complete only if offeror represented itself as a small business concern in paragraph (b)(1) of this provision.) The offeror represents as part of its offer that it [ ] is, [ ] is not a women-owned small business concern.

(5) (Complete if offeror represented itself as disadvantaged in paragraph (b)(2) of this provision.) The offeror shall check the category in which its ownership falls:

\_\_\_ Black American.

\_\_\_ Hispanic American.

\_\_\_ Native American (American Indians, Eskimos, Aleuts, or Native Hawaiians).

\_\_\_\_\_ Asian-Pacific American (persons with origins from Burma, Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore, Brunei, Japan, China, Taiwan, Laos, Cambodia (Kampuchea), Vietnam, Korea, The Philippines, U.S. Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Republic of Palau), Republic of the Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, Samoa, Macao, Hong Kong, Fiji, Tonga, Kiribati, Tuvalu, or Nauru).

\_\_\_\_\_ Subcontinent Asian (Asian-Indian) American (persons with origins from India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Bhutan, the Maldives Islands, or Nepal).

\_\_\_\_\_ Individual/concern, other than one of the preceding.

(c) Definitions.

"Small business concern", as used in this provision, means a concern, including its affiliates, that is independently owned and operated, not dominant in the field of operation in which it is bidding on Government contracts, and qualified as a small business under the criteria in 13 CFR Part 121 and the size standard in paragraph (a) of this provision.

"Women-owned small business concern", as used in this provision, means a small business concern--

(1) Which is at least 51 percent owned by one or more women or, in the case of any publicly owned business, at least 51 percent of the stock of which is owned by one or more women; and

(2) Whose management and daily business operations are controlled by one or more women.

(d) Notice. (1) If this solicitation is for supplies and has been set aside, in whole or in part, for small business concerns, then the clause in this solicitation providing notice of the set-aside contains restrictions on the source of the end items to be furnished.

(2) Under 15 U.S.C. 645(d), any person who misrepresents a firm's status as a small or small disadvantaged business concern in order to obtain a contract to be awarded under the preference programs established pursuant to sections 8(a), 8(d), 9, or 15 of the Small Business Act or any other provision of Federal law that specifically references section 8(d) for a definition of program eligibility, shall--

(i) Be punished by imposition of fine, imprisonment, or both;

(ii) Be subject to administrative remedies, including suspension and debarment; and

(iii) Be ineligible for participation in programs conducted under the authority of the Act.

K.7 52.222-22 PREVIOUS CONTRACTS AND COMPLIANCE REPORTS  
(FEB 1999)

The offeror represents that--

(a) It [ ] has, [ ] has not participated in a previous contract or subcontract subject to the Equal Opportunity clause of this solicitation; the clause originally contained in Section 310 of Executive Order No. 10925, or the clause contained in Section 201 of Executive Order No. 11114;

(b) It [ ] has, [ ] has not filed all required compliance reports; and

(c) Representations indicating submission of required compliance reports, signed by proposed subcontractors, will be obtained before subcontract awards.

K.8 52.222-25 AFFIRMATIVE ACTION COMPLIANCE (APR 1984)

The offeror represents that--

(a) It [ ] has developed and has on file, [ ] has not developed and does not have on file, at each establishment, affirmative action programs required by the rules and regulations of the Secretary of Labor (41 CFR 60-1 and 60-2), or (b) It [ ] has not previously had contracts subject to the written affirmative action programs requirement of the rules and regulations of the Secretary of Labor.

K.9 52.223-1 CLEAN AIR AND WATER CERTIFICATION (APR 1984)

The Offeror certifies that--

(a) Any facility to be used in the performance of this proposed contract is [ ], is not [ ] listed on the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) List of Violating Facilities;

(b) The Offeror will immediately notify the Contracting Officer, before award, of the receipt of any communication from the Administrator, or a designee, of the EPA, indicating that any facility that the Offeror proposes to use for the performance of the contract is under consideration to be listed on the (EPA) List of Violating Facilities; and

(c) The Offeror will include a certification substantially the same as this certification, including this paragraph (c), in every

nonexempt subcontract.

K.10 52.230-1 COST ACCOUNTING STANDARDS NOTICES AND  
CERTIFICATION (APR 1998)

NOTE:

This notice does not apply to small businesses or foreign governments.

This notice is in three parts, identified by Roman numerals I through III.

If the offeror is an educational institution, Part II does not apply unless the contemplated contract will be subject to full or modified CAS coverage pursuant to 48 CFR 9903.201-2(c)(5) or 9903.201-2(c)(6), respectively.

Offerors shall examine each part and provide the requested information in order to determine Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) requirements applicable to any resultant contract.

I. DISCLOSURE STATEMENT-COST ACCOUNTING PRACTICES AND  
CERTIFICATION

(a) Any contract in excess of \$500,000 resulting from this solicitation will be subject to the requirements of the Cost Accounting Standards Board (48 CFR Chapter 99), except for those contracts which are exempt as specified in 48 CFR 9903.201-1.

(b) Any offeror submitting a proposal which, if accepted, will result in a contract subject to the requirements of 48 CFR, Chapter 99 must, as a condition of contracting, submit a Disclosure Statement as required by 48 CFR 9903.202. When required, the Disclosure Statement must be submitted as a part of the offeror's proposal under this solicitation unless the offeror has already submitted a Disclosure Statement disclosing the practices used in connection with the pricing of this proposal. If an applicable Disclosure Statement has already been submitted, the offeror may satisfy the requirement for submission by providing the information requested in paragraph (c) of Part I of this provision.

CAUTION: In the absence of specific regulations or agreement, a practice disclosed in a Disclosure Statement shall not, by virtue of such disclosure, be deemed to be a proper, approved, or agreed-to practice for pricing proposals or accumulating and reporting contract performance cost data.

(c) Check the appropriate box below:

[ ] (1) Certificate of Concurrent Submission of Disclosure Statement. The offeror hereby certifies that, as a part of the offer, copies of the Disclosure Statement have been submitted as

follows: (i) original and one copy to the cognizant Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO) or cognizant Federal agency official authorized to act in that capacity (Federal official), as applicable, and (ii) one copy to the cognizant Federal auditor.

(Disclosure must be on Form No. CASB DS-1 or CASB DS-2, as applicable. Forms may be obtained from the cognizant ACO or Federal official and/or from the loose-leaf version of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.)

Date of Disclosure Statement:

Name and Address of Cognizant ACO or  
Federal Official Where Filed:

---

---

---

---

The offeror further certifies that the practices used in estimating costs in pricing this proposal are consistent with the cost accounting practices disclosed in the Disclosure Statement.

[ ] (2) Certificate of Previously Submitted Disclosure Statement. The offeror hereby certifies that the required Disclosure Statement was filed as follows:

Date of Disclosure Statement:

Name and Address of Cognizant ACO or Federal Official Where Filed:

The offeror further certifies that the practices used in estimating costs in pricing this proposal are consistent with the cost accounting practices disclosed in the applicable Disclosure Statement.

[ ] (3) Certificate of Monetary Exemption. The offeror hereby certifies that the offeror, together with all divisions, subsidiaries, and affiliates under common control, did not receive net awards of negotiated prime contracts and subcontracts subject to CAS totaling more than \$25 million (of which at least one award exceeded \$1 million) in the cost accounting period immediately preceding the period in which this proposal was submitted. The offeror further certifies that if such status changes before an award resulting from this proposal, the offeror will advise the Contracting Officer immediately.

[ ] (4) Certificate of Interim Exemption. The offeror hereby certifies that (i) the offeror first exceeded the monetary exemption for disclosure, as defined in (3) of this subsection, in the cost

accounting period immediately preceding the period in which this offer was submitted and (ii) in accordance with 48 CFR 9903.202-1, the offeror is not yet required to submit a Disclosure Statement. The offeror further certifies that if an award resulting from this proposal has not been made within 90 days after the end of that period, the offeror will immediately submit a revised certificate to the Contracting Officer, in the form specified under subparagraphs (c)(1) or (c)(2) of Part I of this provision, as appropriate, to verify submission of a completed Disclosure Statement.

CAUTION: Offerors currently required to disclose because they were awarded a CAS-covered prime contract or subcontract of \$10 million or more in the current cost accounting period may not claim this exemption (4). Further, the exemption applies only in connection with proposals submitted before expiration of the 90 day period following the cost accounting period in which the monetary exemption was exceeded.

## II. COST ACCOUNTING STANDARDS ELIGIBILITY FOR MODIFIED CONTRACT COVERAGE

If the offeror is eligible to use the modified provisions of 48 CFR subpart 9903.201-2(b) and elects to do so, the offeror shall indicate by checking the box below. Checking the box below shall mean that the resultant contract is subject to the Disclosure and Consistency of Cost Accounting Practices clause in lieu of the Cost Accounting Standards clause.

☐ The offeror hereby claims an exemption from the Cost Accounting Standards clause under the provisions of 48 CFR subpart 9903.201-2(b) and certifies that the offeror is eligible for use of the Disclosure and Consistency of Cost Accounting Practices clause because during the cost accounting period immediately preceding the period in which this proposal was submitted, the offeror received less than \$25 million in awards of CAS-covered prime contracts and subcontracts, or the offeror did not receive a single CAS-covered award exceeding \$1 million. The offeror further certifies that if such status changes before an award resulting from this proposal, the offeror will advise the Contracting Officer immediately.

CAUTION: An offeror may not claim the above eligibility for modified contract coverage if this proposal is expected to result in the award of a CAS-covered contract of \$25 million or more or if, during its current cost accounting period, the offeror has been awarded a single CAS-covered prime contract or subcontract of \$25 million or more.

## III. ADDITIONAL COST ACCOUNTING STANDARDS APPLICABLE TO EXISTING CONTRACTS

The offeror shall indicate below whether award of the contemplated contract would, in accordance with subparagraph (a)(3) of the Cost Accounting Standards clause, require a change in established cost accounting practices affecting existing contracts and subcontracts.

☐ YES

☐ NO

K.11 HUDAR 2452.203-71 CERTIFICATION REGARDING FEDERAL  
EMPLOYMENT (DEC 1992)

By submitting an offer, the offeror hereby certifies that it is not owned or substantially owned or controlled by one or more Federal employees.

K.12 HUDAR 2452.226-70 CERTIFICATION OF STATUS AS A MINORITY  
BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (AUG 1995)

Bidder, Offeror or Supplier certifies that he or she [ ] is, [ ] is not, (check one), a minority business enterprise which is defined as a business which is at least 51 percent owned by one or more minority group members or, in the case of a publicly owned business, at least 51 percent of its voting stock is owned by one or more minority group members, and whose management and daily operations are controlled by one or more such individuals. For the purpose of this definition, minority group members are:

(Check the box applicable to you)

[ ] Black Americans

[ ] Hispanic Americans

[ ] Native Americans

[ ] Asian Pacific Americans

[ ] Asian Indian Americans

K.13 AS 1910 SIGNATURE BLOCK (NOV 1997)

By signature below, the bidder/offeror certifies that all Representations and Certifications contained in the solicitation are complete and accurate as required. 18 U.S.C. Section 1001 and the Program Fraud and Civil Remedies Act of 1986(31 U.S.C. 3801 - 3812) set forth penalties for making false statements in bids/proposals.

---

Signature

---

Typed Name

---

Title

---

Date



## SECTION L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS

L.1 NOTICE LISTING SOLICITATION PROVISIONS INCORPORATED  
BY REFERENCE

The following solicitation provisions pertinent to this section are hereby incorporated by reference (by Citation Number, Title, and Date) in accordance with the FAR provision at FAR "52.252-1 SOLICITATION PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE" in Section L of this solicitation. See FAR 52.252-1 for an internet address (if specified) for electronic access to the full text of a provision.

NUMBER	TITLE	DATE
52.215-1	INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS--COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION ALTERNATE I (OCT 1997)	NOV 1999
52.215-16	FACILITIES CAPITAL COST OF MONEY	OCT 1997
52.219-24	SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION PROGRAM--TARGETS	JAN 1999
52.222-24	PREAWARD ON-SITE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COMPLIANCE EVALUATION	FEB 1999
2452.219-70	SMALL, SMALL DISADVANTAGED AND WOMEN-OWNED SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN	OCT 1995
2452.219-71	SUBMISSION OF SUBCONTRACTING REPORTS	OCT 1999
2452.233-70	REVIEW OF CONTRACTING OFFICER PROTEST DECISION	OCT 1999

L.2 52.204-6 DATA UNIVERSAL NUMBERING SYSTEM (DUNS) NUMBER  
(JUN 1999)

(a) The offeror shall enter, in the block with its name and address on the cover page of its offer, the annotation "DUNS" followed by the DUNS number that identifies the offeror's name and address exactly as stated in the offer. The DUNS number is a nine-digit number assigned by Dun and Bradstreet Information Services.

(b) If the offeror does not have a DUNS number, it should contact Dun and Bradstreet directly to obtain one. A DUNS number will be provided immediately by telephone at no charge to the offeror. For information on obtaining a DUNS number, the offeror, if located within the United States, should call Dun and Bradstreet at 1-800-333-0505. The offeror should be prepared to provide the following information:

(1) Company name.

(2) Company address.

- (3) Company telephone number.
- (4) Line of business.
- (5) Chief executive officer/key manager.
- (6) Date the company was started.
- (7) Number of people employed by the company.
- (8) Company affiliation.

(c) Offerors located outside the United States may obtain the location and phone number of the local Dun and Bradstreet Information Services office from the Internet home page at <http://www.customerservice@dnb.com/>. If an offeror is unable to locate a local service center, it may send an e-mail to Dun and Bradstreet at [globalinfo@mail.dnb.com](mailto:globalinfo@mail.dnb.com).

L.3 52.215-20 REQUIREMENTS FOR COST OR PRICING DATA OR  
INFORMATION OTHER THAN COST OR PRICING DATA (OCT 1997)

(a) Exceptions from cost or pricing data. (1) In lieu of submitting cost or pricing data, offerors may submit a written request for exception by submitting the information described in the following subparagraphs. The Contracting Officer may require additional supporting information, but only to the extent necessary to determine whether an exception should be granted, and whether the price is fair and reasonable.

(i) Identification of the law or regulation establishing the price offered. If the price is controlled under law by periodic rulings, reviews, or similar actions of a governmental body, attach a copy of the controlling document, unless it was previously submitted to the contracting office.

(ii) Commercial item exception. For a commercial item exception, the offeror shall submit, at a minimum, information on prices at which the same item or similar items have previously been sold in the commercial market that is adequate for evaluating the reasonableness of the price for this acquisition. Such information may include--

(A) For catalog items, a copy of or identification of the catalog and its date, or the appropriate pages for the offered items, or a statement that the catalog is on file in the buying office to which the proposal is being submitted. Provide a copy or describe current discount policies and price lists (published or unpublished), e.g., wholesale, original equipment manufacturer, or reseller. Also explain the basis of each offered price and its relationship to the established catalog price, including how the proposed price relates to the price of recent sales in quantities

similar to the proposed quantities;

(B) For market-priced items, the source and date or period of the market quotation or other basis for market price, the base amount, and applicable discounts. In addition, describe the nature of the market;

(C) For items included on an active Federal Supply Service Multiple Award Schedule contract, proof that an exception has been granted for the schedule item.

(2) The offeror grants the Contracting Officer or an authorized representative the right to examine, at any time before award, books, records, documents, or other directly pertinent records to verify any request for an exception under this provision, and the reasonableness of price. For items priced using catalog or market prices, or law or regulation, access does not extend to cost or profit information or other data relevant solely to the offeror's determination of the prices to be offered in the catalog or marketplace.

(b) Requirements for cost or pricing data. If the offeror is not granted an exception from the requirement to submit cost or pricing data, the following applies:

(1) The offeror shall prepare and submit cost or pricing data and supporting attachments in accordance with Table 15-2 of FAR 15.408.

(2) As soon as practicable after agreement on price, but before contract award (except for unpriced actions such as letter contracts), the offeror shall submit a Certificate of Current Cost or Pricing Data, as prescribed by FAR 15.406-2.

#### L.4 52.216-1 TYPE OF CONTRACT (APR 1984)

The Government contemplates award of a CPFF, Indefinite Quantity contract resulting from this solicitation.

#### L.5 52.219-22 SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS STATUS (OCT 1999)

(a) General. This provision is used to assess an offeror's small disadvantaged business status for the purpose of obtaining a benefit on this solicitation. Status as a small business and status as a small disadvantaged business for general statistical purposes is covered by the provision at FAR 52.219-1, Small Business Program Representation.

(b) Representations.

(1) General. The offeror represents, as part of its offer, that it is a small business under the size standard applicable to this acquisition; and either--

[ ] (i) It has received certification by the Small Business Administration as a small disadvantaged business concern consistent with 13 CFR 124, Subpart B; and

(A) No material change in disadvantaged ownership and control has occurred since its certification;

(B) Where the concern is owned by one or more disadvantaged individuals, the net worth of each individual upon whom the certification is based does not exceed \$750,000 after taking into account the applicable exclusions set forth at 13 CFR 124.104(c)(2); and

(C) It is identified, on the date of its representation, as a certified small disadvantaged business concern in the database maintained by the Small Business Administration (PRO-Net); or

[ ] (ii) It has submitted a completed application to the Small Business Administration or a Private Certifier to be certified as a small disadvantaged business concern in accordance with 13 CFR 124, Subpart B, and a decision on that application is pending, and that no material change in disadvantaged ownership and control has occurred since its application was submitted.

(2) [ ] For Joint Ventures. The offeror represents, as part of its offer, that it is a joint venture that complies with the requirements at 13 CFR 124.1002(f) and that the representation in paragraph (b)(1) of this provision is accurate for the small disadvantaged business concern that is participating in the joint venture. [The offeror shall enter the name of the small disadvantaged business concern that is participating in the joint venture: \_\_\_\_\_.]

(c) Penalties and Remedies. Anyone who misrepresents any aspects of the disadvantaged status of a concern for the purposes of securing a contract or subcontract shall:

(1) Be punished by imposition of a fine, imprisonment, or both;

(2) Be subject to administrative remedies, including suspension and debarment; and

(3) Be ineligible for participation in programs conducted under the authority of the Small Business Act.

#### L.6 52.233-2 SERVICE OF PROTEST (AUG 1996)

(a) Protests, as defined in section 33.101 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that are filed directly with an agency, and

copies of any protests that are filed with the General Accounting Office (GAO), shall be served on the Contracting Officer (addressed as follows) by obtaining written and dated acknowledgment of receipt from:

Hand-Carried Address & Mailing Address:

U.S. Department of Housing and  
Urban Development (HUD)  
Office of Procurement and Contracts  
451 Seventh Street, SW, Room 5256  
Washington DC 20410-3000

(b) The copy of any protest shall be received in the office designated above within one day of filing a protest with the GAO.

2452.209-70      POTENTIAL ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICTS OF      FEB 2000  
INTEREST

L.7    HUDAR 2452.215-70    PROPOSAL CONTENT    (OCT 1995)

(a) Proposals shall be submitted in two parts as described in paragraphs (c) and (d) below. Each of the parts must be complete in itself so that evaluation of each part may be conducted independently, and so the technical and management part may be evaluated strictly on its own merit. Proposals shall be submitted in the format, if any, prescribed elsewhere in this solicitation. Proposals shall be enclosed in sealed packaging and addressed to the office specified in the solicitation. The offeror's name and address, the solicitation number and the date and time specified in the solicitation for proposal submission must appear in writing on the outside of the package.

(b) Proposals shall be submitted in original and 7 copies of Part I and 7 copies of Part II.

(c) Part I-Technical and Management.

(1) Prior experience. The offeror shall provide evidence of the offeror's (i.e., firm's or organization's) prior and current experience in performing the work and/or providing the deliverables required by the solicitation.

(2) Past Performance. The offeror shall provide evidence of the offeror's past performance in accomplishing work-including meeting delivery dates and schedules-the same as, or substantially similar to, that required by the solicitation. The offeror shall provide references as follows: Name of Organization, Address, Point of Contact w/ Organization, Telephone Number, and Date of Service.

(3) Personnel qualifications. The offeror shall provide the names, position descriptions and information to support the qualifications-including relevant experience, specialized training and education-of all proposed key personnel (see the clause entitled "Key Personnel" in this solicitation for further definition). The term "personnel" shall include any proposed consultants and subcontractor employees who will perform duties of key personnel.

(4) Management Capability. The offeror shall provide evidence of his/her organization's ability to manage the work required under the proposed contract. The offeror shall describe how the work will be organized, the proposed staffing and the responsibilities and existing commitments of proposed staff.

(5) Technical Capability. The offeror shall provide a detailed description of how he/she proposes to conduct the work required under the proposed contract.

(6) Mandatory Minimum Requirements. The offeror shall provide evidence, including copies of documents in accordance with the requirements of Section C - Statement of Work.

(d) Part II-Business Proposal.

(1) The Offeror shall complete the Representations and Certifications provided in Section K of this solicitation and include them in this Part II.

(2) The offeror shall provide information to support the offeror's proposed costs or prices as prescribed elsewhere in this Section L.

#### L.8 LIMITATION ON SIZE OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

Technical proposals submitted as a result of this solicitation shall be limited to 200 pages of text for the overall effort AND limited to 30 pages for Task Order #1. The above page limitations for each technical proposal includes the cover letter and any resumes, statement of corporate capability and experience, statements of subcontractor capability and experience, lists of previous research, brochures, organization charts, graphics, attachments or exhibits. OFFERORS SHALL NOT SUBMIT ANY RESEARCH REPORTS OR OTHER SAMPLES OF RESEARCH PRODUCTS COMPLETED UNDER PREVIOUS PROJECTS. All pages of each technical proposal for the overall effort and Task Order #1 must be numbered consecutively starting from Page 1. The business proposal and associated certifications from Section K are automatically excluded from the above limitations. Any exclusions from the limitation other than the business proposal are listed below. If no exclusions are listed below, the above limitations apply to the respective technical proposals.

For the purpose of this provision, a page consists of a single leaf of paper, 8 1/2 inches by 11 inches, printed on one side only. However, offerors are encouraged to use recycled paper printed on both sides (see FAR 52.204-4 "PRINTING/COPYING DOUBLE-SIDED ON RECYCLED PAPER"). A single leaf of paper printed on both sides constitutes two pages for the purpose of this limitation. The point size for the technical proposals should be 12 or greater.

If an offeror submits a proposal which exceeds the number of pages specified as the page limit in this provision, the pages exceeding the limit will not be evaluated and this may have a negative effect on the offeror's evaluation.

#### L.9 AS 2112 SPECIAL INSTRUCTION REGARDING LOBBYING DISCLOSURES

If the bidder/offeror is required to complete an SF-LLL, Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (see FAR 52.203-11), the offeror shall obtain the form from the contracting officer or contract specialist identified in the solicitation.

Ð Ì à;±

## SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

## M.1 SOURCE SELECTION - FULL DISCUSSIONS

The Department has determined to use the conventional source selection method for this best value, tradeoff analysis process. In accordance with FAR 15.306(b), the Department may have communications with offerors before establishing the competitive range. After evaluating all proposals in accordance with FAR 15.305(a) and 15.305( c)(1), the Contracting Officer may determine that the number of most highly rated proposals that might otherwise be included in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted. Therefore, for purposes of efficiency, the Contracting Officer may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals. After establishing the competitive range, the Department may conduct exchanges of information (discussions/negotiations). After exchanges are completed, offerors in the competitive range will be requested to submit Proposal Revisions or Final Proposal Revisions (FPR). Upon submission and evaluation of the FPR, a selection decision will be made and a contract will be awarded.

## M.2 RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF TECHNICAL Versus COST/PRICE FACTORS

(a) The Government will make an award to the responsible offeror whose offer conforms to the solicitation and is most advantageous to the Government (i.e., that which represents the best value to the Government), cost or price and other factors considered. The combined relative merit of the technical evaluation factors listed below will be more significant than cost or price in the selection of the Contractor. While the cost or price factor has no numerical weight, it is a criterion in the overall evaluation of proposals. Furthermore, the proposed costs or price must be considered reasonable and must reflect the proposed technical approach.

(b) The Government may award a contract to other than the lowest priced offer. In the event that two or more offers are considered technically equivalent, the evaluated cost or price will be of primary importance in determining the proposal most advantageous to the Government.

## M.3 EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The Government will apply these factors for award to proposals to assess offeror's demonstrated and continuing ability to produce high-quality, pragmatic, cost-effective, and timely responses to research needs. The maximum number of possible award points is 160, and the points available for each factor are indicated in parentheses. Offerors must provide statements within their proposals that address each factor, as well as their response to Task Order #1, "Implementation of the Welfare-To-Work Voucher



Program Evaluation, Evaluation Follow-On Contract Statement of Work" (Section J). Failure to explicitly address any factor will result in no points being assessed for that factor.

The Government will not only evaluate each offeror's proposal to conduct Task Order #1 under Evaluation Factor F, but will also consider the Task Order proposal to be a demonstration of the offeror's capabilities in assessing all other technical factors and evaluating cost or price.

#### FACTORS FOR AWARD

##### A. Technical Capability (45 points)

The Government will assess the offeror's technical capability based on the experience and qualifications of key, in-place, professional personnel who will be available to develop, manage, and conduct task orders under this procurement. This includes the capabilities of direct employees as well as proposed subcontractors and consultants.

Of particular importance are fields of specialization (substantive and methodological); range and depth of experience; capability, including credentials and professional and academic experiences; timely availability during the term of the contract; demonstrated ability to be innovative and pragmatic in making decisions and executing successful analytic approaches, using imperfect data, under compressed time frames; and ability to communicate to non-technical as well as technical audiences.

1) Experience with HUD, government, or other public programs and policies, especially involving large-scale analyses and research relating to assisted housing and welfare policies and programs, particularly regarding Section 8 tenant-based rules, operations and management; housing mobility; and the relationship between housing and employment.

2) Research experience in housing and community development, urban affairs, social sciences, and economics especially involving the following:

(a.) Presentation of analytic findings and data clearly and in appropriate context to public decision makers and program officials; prepared clear, professional technical reports and non-technical reports; disseminated research results effectively through various vehicles. (b.) Management of data collection over multiple sites on a national scale; has experience with or knowledge of OMB clearance procedures and forms for information collection and respondent burden. (c.) Development and use of data collection instruments administered on site, by telephone, by Internet, or by mail; collected qualitative data such as from ethnographic interviews and other field work, focus groups, archival reviews. (d.) Development of statistically valid samples and generalizations from a sample to a population universe; and conducted statistical analyses and analyses of qualitative information. (e.) Development and implementation of projects involving experimental design, including random assignment of participants to experimental and control groups.

3) Experience with data systems and computer analysis, including: developing, managing, modifying, and using complex data bases, including data entry, data cleaning, integrating information from diverse sources, and developed meaningful indicators from raw variables in both mainframe and personal computer environments; conducting data processing in personal computer environments using common research and business software. Knowledge of or experience using HUD information systems or data extracted from such systems.

4) Experience in qualitative analysis, including designing and conducting qualitative research that uses such methods as in-depth qualitative interviews, focus groups, and participant observation and that is well integrated into the larger research design.

B. Corporate Capability (35 points)

The Government will assess the offeror's demonstrated and continuing capability, experience, background, resources, and current organizational capabilities in the following areas:

1) Offeror's experience and capability to direct contracts and conduct work of the type and scope requested in this RFP.

2) Offeror's ability to develop and manage teams of staff, subcontractors, and consultants, and to coordinate their work performance as part of conducting work of the type and scope requested in this RFP.

3) Offeror's ability to provide stability, continuity, and uniformity of both staff and management.

C. Understanding the Problem (30 points)

The Government will assess the offeror's understanding of the problems surrounding implementation of a controlled experiment to evaluate a public intervention intended to effect a complex public objective, in this case, the impact of the offer and use of housing vouchers on the ability of eligible families to obtain or retain employment:

1) Offeror's substantive understanding of the Section 8 program and its Welfare to Work Voucher component and the issues surrounding that program and its implementation.

2) Offeror's understanding of the challenges implicit in orchestrating successfully an experimental design of a complex social program in multiple sites.

3) Offeror's understanding of the critical nature of effective tracking of all participants and insight about how such tracking could be accomplished among a lower income, mobile population.

4) Offeror's understanding of the types and quality of analyses that must be brought to bear to draw conclusive findings about the impact of housing availability and choice on employment success

among low-income families.

D. Technical Approach (20 points)

The Government will assess offeror's technical approach for mobilizing and managing its staff and resources to respond effectively to the Government's research needs in the following areas:

- 1) Soundness of offeror's organizational framework to assure responsiveness to anticipated task orders, including ability to incorporate rapidly and effectively, any proposed subcontractors or consultants.
- 2) Strength of offeror's proposed technical approach for managing individual tasks and for providing overall contract direction, oversight, and allocation of resources.
- 3) Offeror's understanding of operating in a fast-turnaround environment to conduct research, evaluation, and program monitoring in support of HUD's high-priority policy and program needs.

E. Past Performance (15 points)

The Government will assess offeror's experience in conducting high quality analyses within time, scope, and budget. Documentation shall be provided by the offeror, which will be confirmed by reference checks, that, within the five years immediately prior to the date of its offer, it has performed, to the satisfaction of all customers, all assignments comparable to the varied services required in the Request for Proposal. The offeror must address any performance issues, including those that were due to circumstances beyond the offeror's control or were otherwise satisfactorily resolved with no net effect on the quality or timeliness of work. The information should be provided as follows:

- a) Contract Number; b) Description of services c) Contracting Officer and Government Technical Representative d) Agency or organization; e) Original and Final Dollar amounts; f) Original and final contract performance periods; g) An indication of whether the contract was completed on time and failure to complete on time and within budget.

With regard to the contracts identified above, the offeror is authorized to provide information on problems encountered on the identified contracts and the offeror's corrective actions. The Government shall consider this information, as well as information obtained from any other sources, when evaluating the offeror's past performance.

F. Response to Task Order #1 "Implementation of the Welfare-To-Work Voucher

Program Evaluation, Evaluation Follow-On Contract Statement of Work (15 points)

The Government will assess the overall value to the Government of offeror's proposal to conduct Task Order #1: "Implementation of the

Welfare-To-Work Voucher Program Evaluation, Evaluation Follow-On Contract Statement of Work", based on responsiveness, substantive understanding, quality of technical approach and management approach and cost-effectiveness of proposed approach.

#### M.4 EVALUATION OF PROPOSED PRICES/COSTS

In addition to the factors for award, the offeror's business proposal will be considered to determine which proposal is most advantageous to the Government. Business proposals will be the determining factor when proposals ranked under the above factors are considered acceptable, fall within the competitive range, and are substantially equal. Furthermore, an offeror's business proposal will not be considered if it is determined that it is unrealistically low or unreasonably high. For evaluation purposes, the Government will evaluate prices/costs on the basis of the total cost-plus-fixed-fee amount for Task Order #1 provided in Section J.